The American Ecclesiastical Review

Vol. CXXXV, No. 2 August, 1951

CONTENTS

"The Foundling" . . . *Bishop Christopher J. Weldon* 81

The Leonine Prayers . . . . . *Richard E. Brennan* 85

The *St. Thérèse* of Maxence van der Meersch *Edward A. Ryan, S.J.* 95

A Legion of Decency Program . . *Edward S. Schwegler* 107

The Meaning of Mary's Compassion. Part II *Thomas U. Mullaney, O.P.* 120

". . . And I Work." Part IV . *Francis J. McGarrigle, S.J.* 130

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

Benediction Hymns 142

Another Benediction Problem 142

Communion Problems 143

Baptismal Difficulties 144

Sick Call Corporal 144

Veiling the Ciborium 145

Missal Stand Cover 145

(Contents Continued on Next Page)

Published monthly by The Catholic University of America Press, Washington 17, D. C. Subscription price in U. S. currency or equivalent: United States, Canada, $5.00; Foreign, $5.00; 50 cents per copy.

Entered as second class matter, November 30, 1944, at the Post Office at Washington, D. C., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Accepted for mailing at the special rate of postage provided for under Act of March 5, 1930, under Act of February 28, 1925.

Business communications, including subscriptions and changes of address, should be addressed to The American Ecclesiastical Review, The Catholic University of America Press, Washington 17, D. C.

Please address all manuscripts and editorial correspondence to The Editor, The American Ecclesiastical Review, The Catholic University of America, Washington, D. C.

Copyright 1951, by The Catholic University of America Press

(*Contents Continued from Previous Page*)

Sacraments for the Dying 146

The Disposal of a Collection 147

Renewal of Marriage Consent 148

Apparitions of Our Lady 148

ANALECTA 150

BOOK REVIEWS

The Lives of the Saints, *by Omer Englebert* 155

Portrait of Saint Gemma: A Stigmatic, *by Sister Saint Michael, S.S.J.* 157

Benedictine Peace, *by Dom Idesbald Van Houtryve* . . . 158

Queen of Paradox, *by Katherine Brégy* 159

BOOK NOTES 160

THE CORPORATIVE STATE

by JOAQUIN AZPIAZU, S.J.

***Translated by* William Bresnahan, O.S.B.**

$4.00

THE learned Jesuit, author of this work, is regarded in Europe as a most reliable authority on the subject of the corporative regime.

Most American readers are not aware of the extent to which corporative forms of economic and social life have developed in several European countries. In view of the likelihood that we are destined willy-nilly to take a hand in European affairs, we shall do well to become acquainted with this organization of society.

The fact that corporativism has in some countries become associated with dictatorship is misleading regarding the nature of a corporative regime, which does not include governmental absolutism in its program. With us, the period of ruthless capitalism has been followed by the towering might of organized labor and increased tension between employers and workers. Mutual understanding and cooperation, the calculated fruit of corporativism, seems to be the only sound remedy for that growing tension, as it is also the remedy advocated by successive popes. Let us at least familiarize ourselves with its workings and then adopt from it those elements congenial to our temperament and traditions.

At your bookstore or from

B. HERDER BOOK COMPANY

15 & 17 So. Broadway **St. Louis 2, Mo.**

In answering advertisements please mention THE AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW

"THE FOUNDLING"

The Foundling, a novel by His Eminence Francis Cardinal Spellman, Archbishop of New York, has already given rise to two very definite schools of thought. There are those who are inclined to dismiss the book rather superficially and condescendingly as a rather amateurish effort on the part of a man whose very busy life quite understandably did not allow him the abundance of time taken by professional novel writers in their works. The other group had deep enough convictions about the worth of the book to cause them to have it published in magazine form in *Good Housekeeping* and to choose it as a Literary Guild selection for the month of June.

I personally would recommend it to the time and attention of all our people because of its positive and constructive contribution to the understanding and enjoyment of life in 20th century America. It is a refreshing antidote to some of our modern so-called "quality" best sellers which are supposed to be realistic but seem to be able to present only the morbid, abnormal, gruesome and pessimistic aspects of reality. It is consoling to anyone who has had the privilege of living and working with our GI's during the trying days of war and the equally difficult days of readjustment after their return home to know that their case is presented so as to reveal their fundamental goodness and genuine strength of character. It has been discouraging at times to see novelists acclaimed as masters in presenting the GI as a rather rough, vulgar, dirty, ugly individual, not only in his physical appearance and fighting temper during the heat of battle, but in his moral or psychological make-up under all circumstances. No one is going to deny that in every human being there are some less praiseworthy and less desirable characteristics but certainly we should not dwell upon this phase of things to the overshadowing, not to say complete exclusion of the other side of man's nature.

Any human being who allows his mind and heart a little freedom can readily appreciate the reluctance of both Paul, the wounded GI of World War I and Peter, the blind casualty of World War II to come home to inflict their wounds and limitations upon their loved ones. Wounded veterans having had the generosity of heart

and the sensitivity of soul to give themselves to the service of an ideal, to the point of risking their lives and sacrificing their physical integrity, can appreciate the demands that are made upon the minds and hearts of others to accept them in their "damaged condition." Being willing to forget self in the service of others they follow through logically on that dedication in not wanting to demand for themselves the attention and services necessary in their maimed state. But no one can say that Peter and Paul are not true to life because they are not depicted as surly, embittered and crushed characters.

If good literature is a mirror of the times, then this work, even with its limitations, might deservedly be placed in that category because it does hold up to us for study the things that make a human being great in any age and which have been the characteristics of our American GI's in this twentieth century. It makes quite clear that a man still lives and proves himself a man by what he has in his soul rather than by virtue of his physical make-up.

Not only are the amputee, Paul, and the blind Peter shown to have deep and lasting qualities of mind and heart, rugged strength of soul and sensitivity of feelings, but the other characters, likewise, are set forth as possessing along with their share of human weaknesses, imperfections and limitations an abundance of fine and serviceable qualities. It is true that one wishes the author might have had time to fill out some sections of the book instead of giving us in a few strong strokes just the rough outline of the various characters. The absence of detail, however, and the economy of descriptive material which a professional writer might have given, serve to highlight more effectively the things that all of us should treasure and try to emulate in our individual lives. There is an unmistakable invitation to the reader to learn to be a finer individual in his private life, a more responsible and co-operative citizen in his community life and a more worthy and lovable child of our Heavenly Father.

Having been a military Chaplain in World War II and having had the equally great privilege of serving the institutions that care for our dependent, neglected and foundling children for some three years after the war, I feel that His Eminence has caught and conveyed to paper a very good picture of the spirit of both services for the preservation and further development of our

American way of life. To the extent that more of us can understand and duplicate in our lives the spirit of optimism and the living faith so effectively presented in this novel can and will our country continue to prosper. I do hope and pray that other writers will catch the keynote sounded by Cardinal Spellman in *The Foundling* and carry it further into the literature of our day. It seems to me that in our devotion to the standard of realism, we have been tending so much towards physical, material and worldly realism that it amounts almost to the denial of the existence of spiritual realism. Yet all of us know that it has been the spiritual qualities of our pilgrim fathers and their descendants that have been primarily responsible under God for the progress of our nation through the years.

Ours is an era when we pay a great deal of attention to the advertising and packaging of a product. Frequently we are sold on this basis more than on the merits of the article itself. At times one suspects that we are allowing this practice to carry over from the realm of our physical or material life into that of our intellectual and spiritual life. It is most encouraging, therefore, in the case of *The Foundling* where one might criticize the packaging, or literary form of the story, to note that so competent a group as the editors of *Good Housekeeping* and the book judges of the Literary Guild realize that here is a work of genuine value, both refreshingly different and also spiritually nourishing. Say what one may about the limitations of the author in the technical or mechanical dexterity of the novelist, one must not minimize the power, beauty and inspiration in the simplicity and open-hearted goodness of Paul's mother, the Sisters at The Foundling Hospital and at Mount Mary, Ellen, Paul's wife, and Barbara, Peter's fiancée; as well as in the ruggedness and resiliency of Peter and Paul. The simple, imaginative practicality of William Snoggins Mulrooney, sacristan at Saint Rita's Church, brings a lightness of touch and humor to the story that all of us have seen at one time or another in real life even though we might not have appreciated it highly.

For all these simple folk living unaffected lives as children of Almighty God, their loving Father, such problems as differences in religion or race are not major problems or insuperable barriers and are not allowed to become artificial challenges—they are accepted as part of the program of life in the United States in the

twentieth century, are faced honestly and courageously and are lived with comfortably and successfully.

It would seem to me that every last one of our citizens from the most learned, worldly wise and sophisticated to the most uneducated and socially unclassified might read this book with much profit. All that is required is openness of mind and heart. Approaching *The Foundling* in this fashion it could well be that one might find the book bringing light and conviction to one's mind and warmth and generosity to one's heart to such a degree as to keep both permanently open to the grace of God and to the need of one's fellow-man.

✠ CHRISTOPHER J. WELDON
Bishop of Springfield

THE PRIEST'S HOPE OF SALVATION

After having saved the Jews from the hands of the Philistines by the victory that he won with so much personal danger, Jonathan was condemned to death by Saul for having, contrary to his orders, eaten a little honey. But the people cried out: "Shall Jonathan then die, who hath wrought this great salvation in Israel?" Thus they obtained his pardon. The priest who has saved souls may well expect a similar reward on the day of his death. These souls will come and say to Jesus Christ: "Wilt Thou, O Lord, send to hell the priest who has delivered us from eternal misery?" And if Saul remitted the punishment of death at the prayers of the people, surely God will not refuse to pardon such a priest for the prayers of the souls that are his friends in heaven. Priests who have labored for the salvation of souls will hear from God Himself the announcement of eternal rest. What consolation and confidence will the remembrance of having gained a soul to Jesus Christ infuse at the hour of death! As repose is sweet to him who is oppressed with fatigue, so death is sweet to a priest who has labored for God.

—St. Alphonsus in *Dignity and Duties of the Priest* (Brooklyn, 1927), p. 173.

THE LEONINE PRAYERS

Of late years this term has been found a convenient one to designate the prayers which usually are recited after Low Mass. It has reference to the fact that Leo XIII first prescribed these prayers for the universal Church. The only addition that has been made since that time is the three-fold invocation of the Sacred Heart. However, while the prayers have otherwise remained substantially the same through succeeding pontificates, they have been the subject of considerable legislation on the part of the Congregation of Sacred Rites in the course of the years. In fact, it is surprising that a requirement seemingly so simple should have provoked so many doubts—doubts as to when they must be said (or, rather, when they may be omitted) and as to the way in which they should be recited.

As early as 1859 some prayers had been ordered to be said after Mass by Pius IX, but only in the Papal States where very disturbed conditions prevailed. The situation grew increasingly worse and in 1884—fourteen years after the occupation of Rome and the complete loss of the temporal power—Leo XIII commanded that prayers be said throughout the world at the conclusion of Low Mass to implore the divine assistance in those difficult times. These prayers, to which an indulgence of 300 days was attached, were the following:

Ave Maria (ter)
Salve Regina
V) Ora pro nobis, Sancta Dei Genitrix
R) Ut digni efficiamur promissionibus Christi

Oremus

Deus, refugium nostrum et virtus, adesto piis Ecclesiae tuae precibus, et praesta: ut, intercedente gloriosa et Immaculata Virgine Dei Genitrice Maria, beato Josepho, ac beatis Apostolis tuis Petro et Paulo et omnibus Sanctis, quod in praesentibus necessitatibus humiliter petimus, efficaciter consequamur. Per eumdem Christum Dominum nostrum. R) Amen

The decree of the Congregation of Rites directed that the prayers be said *kneeling* after every Mass *sine cantu*. On Dec. 29,

1884, the Congregation of Indulgences declared that "these prayers are to be recited with the people, either in Latin, or in the vernacular provided the translation is faithful."

In 1886 certain changes were made in the prayers. The text of the *Deus, refugium* was altered to the form in which we now have it, and the prayer to St. Michael (a kind of exorcism) was added. The collection of *Decreta Authentica S.R.C.* does not contain this later enactment (at least a careful search has failed to discover it), but the *Irish Ecclesiastical Review* (VII [1886], 1050) gives the revised form of the prayers as follows:

Ave Maria (ter)
Salve Regina
V)Ora pro nobis . . .
R)Ut digni . . .

Oremus

Deus, refugium nostrum et virtus, populum ad te clamantem propitius respice: et intercedente gloriosa et Immaculata Virgine, Dei Genitrice Maria, cum beato Josepho eius Sponso, ac beatis Apostolis tuis Petro et Paulo et omnibus Sanctis, quas pro conversione peccatorum, pro libertate et exaltatione sanctae Matris Ecclesiae, preces effundimus, misericors et benignus exaudi. Per Christum Dominum Nostrum. Amen

Addatur invocatio: Sanctae Michael Archangele, defende nos in praelio; contra nequitiam et insidias diaboli esto praesidium.—Imperet illi Deus, supplices deprecamur; tuque, Princeps militiae coelestis, Satanam aliosque spiritus malignos, qui ad perditionem animarum pervagantur in mundo, divina virtute in infernum detrude. Amen

(Pope Leo XIII grants to all who recite these prayers an indulgence of 300 days)

Pope Pius X in 1904 *permitted* the addition of the threefold invocation: "Most Sacred Heart of Jesus, have mercy on us," and granted an indulgence of 7 years and 7 quarantines to the faithful who recite this together with the priest after the prescribed prayers.[1] While not preceptive, the saying of this ejaculation is recom-

[1] Congregation of Indulgences, June 17, 1904. Cf. *Ephemerides liturgicae*, XVIII, 458.

mended.[2] In this decree we are also told that it suffices for the gaining of the indulgence that the priest say *Cor Iesu Sacratissimum* and the people respond *Miserere nobis.* Apart, then, from a ruling of the local ordinary, this addition to the Leonine Prayers is not mandatory, but it seems to be general practice to make it.

Meanwhile, in 1900 a new Latin prayer card had been issued (presumably by order of the Congregation of Rites) in which two slight corrections were made in the prayer *Deus, refugium.* Prior to that time the reading had been *beato Josepho,* which did not conform to the custom invariably followed in liturgical prayers of not declining the name of the foster father of our Lord (thus differentiating it from the name of other saints, like Josephus Calasanctius). This was changed to *beato Joseph.* Further, in the conclusion of the prayer the word *eumdem* was inserted before *Christum* to bring it into agreement with the rules governing the endings of liturgical orations.[3] *The American Ecclesiastical Review* refers to this change to *eumdem* made by the Congregation of Rites.[4] Since 1900 (and the introduction of the Sacred Heart invocation in 1904) there has been no change in the Latin text of the prayers, but in the English translations there has been a regrettable diversity.

As already stated, Leo XIII granted an indulgence of 300 days for the recitation of the prayers after Low Mass. To encourage the faithful to forego the premature exit which seems to be so appealing and to remain and join in the recitation of the prayers after Mass, Pius XI increased the indulgence to 10 years.[5] This did not revoke the grant made by Pius X for the recitation of the Sacred Heart ejaculation. In the present official collection of indulgenced prayers we are told that an indulgence of 10 years is granted to the faithful who recite these prayers kneeling and with the priest, after the celebration of a private Mass at which they have devoutly assisted; further, if the threefold *Cor Iesu Sacratissimum, miserere nobis* is added, an indulgence of 7 years.[6]

[2] Cong. Indulg., Aug. 19, 1904. Cf. *Ephem. lit.,* XVIII, 595.

[3] Cf. Van der Stappen, *Sacra liturgia* (ed. 1906), III, 481.

[4] Cf. *AER,* LXXIX, 3 (Aug. 1928), 202.

[5] Cf. *A.A.S.* (1934), 312. Cf. O'Connell, *The Celebration of Mass* (ed. 1940), I, 210.

[6] Cf. *Enchiridion indulgentiarum* (1950), no. 675.

It is clear from the statement in the *Enchiridion indulgentiarum* that the indulgence can be gained only by one who has devoutly assisted at the Mass (not, therefore, by a person who happens to come in as Mass is ending), and that the faithful must recite these prayers together with the priest and in a kneeling posture. Just *how* the people are to join in is not stated. In Rome the priest says the first part of the Ave Maria, the people the latter part; the Salve Regina is said in common by priest and people.[7] The *Caeremoniale seraphicum* (ed. 1927, p. 157, note 6) does direct that the *Deus, refugium* and the prayer to St. Michael be said only by the priest. In the United States it seems to be rather common practice for the people to say the prayer to St. Michael together with the celebrant, and surely there can be no objection to this. As above noted, the Congregation of Indulgences declared that the Sacred Heart invocation may be said by the priest, the people responding "Have mercy on us."

Liturgists found several anomalies in these appendages to Low Mass, for instance: the celebrant garbed in Mass vestments kneeling, the prayer (Salve Regina) invariable throughout the year, the fact that the vernacular may be used provided it is faithful. Consequently, they did not regard them with enthusiasm and they probably hoped that the obligation to recite them would cease after the death of Leo XIII. However, his immediate successor, Pius X, promptly declared that he wished the recitation of these prayers to be continued.[8] After the election of Benedict XV the Congregation of Rites was asked whether the recitation of these prayers after Mass was to be continued, and the answer was in the affirmative.[9] From that time until the signing of the Lateran Treaty in 1928 (which solved the "Roman Question," for which the Leonine Prayers had been said for nearly half a century) there was no expectation that this obligation would be rescinded. And then Pius XI, in a Consistorial Allocution of June 30, 1930, ordered that the Leonine Prayers be said *for Russia,* charging the

[7] Cf. Croegaert, *De rubricis missalis Romani* (ed. 1935), p. 94. This author does not state how the other prayers are said in Rome; presumably they are said by the priest alone.

[8] S.R.C., Sept. 11, 1903. Cf. *Ephem. lit.*, XVII, 586; XVIII, 458.

[9] S.R.C., Nov. 24, 1915, no. 4333.

bishops and other clergy carefully to inform the people of this and frequently to recall it to their minds.[10]

We have seen that one reason why liturgists did not look with favor on the Leonine Prayers was the fact that they might be said in the vernacular. In Rome, it is true, they are said in Latin; it is usual there for the people to say prayers (e.g. the Rosary) in that language. Elsewhere, in many seminaries they are recited in Latin and some bishops require this. The same is true in certain convents in which the nuns say the Divine Office in Latin.[11] But in our parish churches in this country the prayers after Mass are said in English, or in other vernacular languages where such are used in preaching.

The differences in the various English translations hitherto current in the United States were slight, but still enough to cause confusion, e.g. when a congregation was accustomed to one version of the prayers and a visiting priest made use of another. Within the past few years an effort has been made to bring about uniformity. At the behest of the bishops of the United States a translation was made and it has been introduced in the various dioceses with the *Imprimatur* of the respective ordinaries. Concerning this translation the comment is occasionally heard that the conclusion of the prayer "O God, our refuge and our strength" is inaccurate because it is: "Through the *same* Christ our Lord," whereas the name of our Lord does not occur in the body of the prayer. But this stricture is unwarranted, as the conclusion of the prayer is unquestionably correct. We have seen that the revised Latin prayer card issued in 1900 inserted the word *eumdem* which had been omitted in the 1886 decree and in the prayer card used for several years.

In the August, 1900, issue of the *Ephemerides liturgicae* (XIV, 474) the matter was discussed and it is there stated that an attempt had been made to defend the omission of this word on the ground that Christ is mentioned only "implicitly" in the body of the prayer (*Dei Genitrice*). The writer maintains that this argument is not convincing, particularly when we consider that in the Missal several orations have this same "implicit" mention

[10] Cf. *A.A.S.* (1930), 301. Cf. Croegaert, *op. cit.*, p. 93.

[11] Cf. Croegaert, *op. cit.*, p. 94.

of our Lord and still conclude with *Per eumdem.* Examples of this are given: in the *Orationes diversae,* in no. 1 *(Concede)* there is a similar arrangement in the collect *(Concede . . . Dei Genitricis Mariae . . . Per eumdem Dominum);* in no. 2 *(A cunctis)* in the collect and postcommunion; and in the postcommunion of the Votive Mass of the Blessed Virgin during the Christmas season. The writer goes on to say that two months previously (which would be June, 1900) he saw a revised prayer card in which the error was corrected and he remarks that undoubtedly the emendation was made with the authorization of the Congregation of Rites. He also notes that the inaccuracy *Josepho* has been corrected. In the LeVavasseur-Haegy-Stercky *Manuel de Liturgie* (ed. 1935, I, 500) it is expressly stated that the conclusion of the prayer is *Per eumdem.* Without laboring this point further, we may mention the fact that in the official *Preces et Opera* issued in 1929, and in the later collections of indulgenced works and prayers which superseded it (1938 and 1950), the conclusion is this: *Per eumdem Christum Dominum nostrum. Amen.* Similarly in the official English translation: *"Through the same Christ our Lord. Amen."*[12] (Unfortunately in this English translation the words: "for the conversion of sinners" have been omitted through a typographical error; the Latin text printed on the same page has the words: *"pro conversione peccatorum").*

Several ceremonial details have been matters of discussion and some of them have been submitted to the Congregation of Rites for clarification. In 1885 this Congregation was asked whether the priest should bow to the Crucifix before coming down to recite the prayers; also whether he should say them kneeling on the footpace or on the lowest step. The Congregation replied that the bow was neither prescribed nor forbidden; and that the priest might kneel either on the footpace or on the lowest step.[13] Rubricists debate whether it is preferable for the priest to return to the center of the altar after the last Gospel or to come down directly from the Gospel corner. Croegaert tells us that the latter way is deemed less proper by some authors who maintain that it would

[12] Cf. *The Raccolta,* trans. Christopher-Spence (1943), no. 628.

[13] S.R.C., no. 3637, *dub.* 8.

be better to return to the center of the altar and then go down the steps, as is done at the beginning of Mass after the Missal has been opened.[14] Moretti, on the other hand, directs that as soon as the server has answered *Deo gratias* the priest turn to his right and descend the steps.[15] This is a matter of choice, pure and simple; to come down obliquely is no more objectionable here than it is at the singing of the Gloria and Credo in High Mass and this the rubricists favor. Another point of discussion is whether the priest may hold the chalice while he recites the prayers. Croegaert looks askance at this, and in particular discountenances the practice of holding the chalice in one hand and the prayer card in the other, or placing the card on top of the burse and steadying it with the right hand.[16] O'Connell says: "It is a general rule that prayers outside Mass are said with joined hands (unless they have to be read from a book) and so the celebrant ought not to have the chalice in his hands while reciting the Leonine Prayers. In any case, he is to take the chalice 'omnibus absolutis' (R, XII, 6), and, therefore, not before he has said the prescribed prayers."[17] The LeVavasseur *Manuel* would permit the priest to hold the chalice while reciting the prayers or to leave it on the altar until the prayers are finished.[18] Priests who find it difficult to negotiate steps might rout scruples by accepting this opinion. Obviously, though, if use of the card is necessary, it is an awkward bit of jugglery to hold the chalice in one hand and the card in the other and it is unseemly to place the card on top of the burse. There is no obligation to end the prayers with the Sign of the Cross, in fact it seems better not to do so. There appears to be no rubrical prescription for ending any liturgical function with the Sign of the Cross (though several begin with it); besides, the priest is not supposed to conclude his prayers at this point, but should at once say the antiphon and begin the canticle which he recites on the way from the altar to the sacristy.

[14] Cf. *De celebrante* (1935), p. 129.

[15] Cf. *Caeremoniale iuxta ritum Romanum* (1937), II, 485.

[16] Cf. *De celebrante*, p. 128.

[17] *The Celebration of Mass*, II, 126.

[18] Cf. I, 500.

Originally the Leonine Prayers were ordered to be said after every Low Mass *(in fine cuiusque Missae sine cantu celebratae)*; but the regulation of 1886 (as it appears in the *Irish Ecclesiastical Record)* is slightly different: *post privatae Missae celebrationem.* "Low Mass" and "Private Mass" are not altogether convertible. In the course of time a number of questions arose concerning the lawfulness of omitting the prayers on various occasions, and there are quite a few decrees of the S.R.C. bearing on this subject. Unfortunately, the meaning of some of the decrees is not crystal clear and rubricists have not been able to reach complete agreement in interpreting them for us. This, perhaps, we can scarcely expect here below, and we must have recourse to probabilism to rid ourselves of wooly ideas. Without being so brash as to get involved in these arguments, we shall content ourselves with setting down (substantially) the occasions on which the Leonine Prayers *may* be omitted as they are listed by Fr. O'Connell in his excellent *The Celebration of Mass.*

(1) After a Low Mass which: (a) takes the place of a Solemn Mass, e.g. a Conventual Mass when not sung, an Ordination Mass or the Mass of the Consecration of a Bishop (when not sung), the Funeral Mass (when not sung—normally it should be a High or Solemn Mass); or (b) has the privileges of a Solemn Votive Mass *pro re gravi,* e.g. the Votive Mass of the Sacred Heart on the first Friday of the month, or of Christ the High and Eternal Priest on the first Thursday—or Saturday—of the month.[19]

(2) After a Low Mass which—like a Conventual Mass or a Privileged Votive Mass—is celebrated *with a certain solemnity,* either intrinsic or extrinsic, so that it may be regarded as almost a Solemn Mass, e.g. the Low Mass celebrated on the occasion of a marriage, or of the administration of Confirmation, or of a general Communion as at the close of a mission or retreat.[20] Other examples of a Low Mass celebrated "with solemnity" are: the Masses of Candlemas, Ash Wednesday, Holy Thursday and Holy Saturday when the rite of the *Memoriale rituum* is followed (of course High Mass may be sung if conditions permit); the first Mass of a newly ordained priest; a Jubilee Mass; a Mass at

[19] Cf. S.R.C., no. 3697, *dub.* 7; no. 4177, *dub.* 1; no. 4271, *dub.* 2.

[20] Cf. S.R.C., no. 4305.

which religious profession is made or vows are renewed. Ordinarily the prayers may not be omitted after the Parochial Mass on Sundays when this is a Low Mass;[21] but if this be celebrated with some special solemnity, it would seem that the principle about "solemnity" laid down in S.R.C. no. 4305 would apply and that the prayers may be omitted.

(3) If any "sacred function or pious exercise immediately and duly (i.e. in accordance with liturgical law) follows, without the celebrant leaving the altar," e.g. Benediction, the prayers of a novena, the distribution of ashes, the presentation of a relic to be kissed, a sermon.[22] To go to the bench to remove the chasuble and maniple is not regarded as "leaving the altar." The LeVavasseur *Manuel* states that this permission (concerning a function or pious exercise immediately following Mass) applies only when the celebrant of the Mass presides at the function or exercise which follows.

Fr. O'Connell, differing from some rubricists, is of the opinion that the Leonine Prayers may be omitted when distribution of Holy Communion immediately follows Mass. While the proponents of the opposite view have some arguments for their position, O'Connell's interpretation of the decrees seems to be logical and admissible.

When two or three Masses (Christmas or All Souls' Day) follow one another immediately, so that the celebrant does not leave the altar, the prayers are said only after the Last Mass.[23] If on Christmas Day (or *a pari* on All Souls' Day) the third Mass is to be a Solemn (or High) Mass, and immediately follows the second Mass, the prayers are not said after the second Mass.[24] Fr. O'Connell says: "This response seems to direct the celebrant to omit the prayers even if he leaves the altar—momentarily, of course—to join the other sacred ministers in the procession out for the Solemn Mass.[25]

In 1916 the Congregation of Rites was asked whether the

[21] Cf. S.R.C., no. 3957.

[22] Cf. S.R.C., no. 4305.

[23] Cf. S.R.C., no. 3855, *dub.* 7.

[24] Cf. S.R.C., no. 3936, *dub.* 1.

[25] *The Celebration of Mass*, I, 211.

Leonine Prayers should be omitted when Mass is said in the oratory of a religious community and the community is engaged at the time in reading a meditation, assisting at another Mass or coming up for Holy Communion. The answer was negative; the prayers in such circumstances should be said in a low tone of voice by the priest and so answered by the server.[26]

RICHARD E. BRENNAN

Notre Dame College
Cleveland, Ohio

[26] Cf. Croegaert, *De rubricis missalis Romani*, p. 96. The author cites a decree of the S.R.C. of June 2, 1916, to this effect, but notes that it is not found in the *Decreta authentica*.

THE LAX PRIEST

A lax priest is of all men most to be pitied. When his priesthood ceases to be sweet to him, it becomes first tasteless, and then bitter in the mouth. The perpetual round of the same actions and the same obligations becomes mechanical and automatous. *Sancta sancte*, as the Council of Carthage enjoins. But when holy things cease to be sustaining and refreshing, they are a yoke which galls, and a burden which oppresses. Such priests easily omit Mass, and have no sense of loss.

Still they may preach high doctrines of the spiritual life with as much eloquence as ever. But their heart does not go with their words; and to ears that can hear there is a hollow ring in all they say. Such men will read the lives of the Saints, and desire to be like them. They try and fall short. They retain an intellectual perception of some high standard which is habitually in their mouth till an unconscious intellectual simulation is formed, sometimes with self-deception, which is dangerous; sometimes with conscious unreality, which is worse. Such men grow inwardly hollow. There is decay at the heart, and a preparation for falling. The words of Isaias are fearful and true: "Therefore shall this iniquity be to you as a breach that falleth, and is found wanting in a high wall; for the destruction thereof shall come on a sudden, when it is not looked for." Many a time when a priest has fallen all men have wondered except one or two, who have closely watched him, and his own conscience, which has known the secret of his fall.

—Henry Edward Cardinal Manning in *The Eternal Priesthood* (Westminster, Md.: The Newman Bookshop, 1944), pp. 85 f.

THE *ST. THERESE* OF MAXENCE VAN DER MEERSCH

Since her death fifty-four years ago, St. Thérèse of the Infant Jesus has been the subject of some strange studies. An American woman writing of her influence in the Episcopalian Church received pre-publication messages from two bishops of that communion. In a book which from the literary point of view is not devoid of merit, a German woman advances the impossible theory that Thérèse was poorly endowed naturally, of very little value from the human viewpoint, and the victim of an education which narrowed her still more. But among all the works on the Little Flower there is none which caused more of a stir than the novel published in 1947 by the well-known French novelist, Maxence van der Meersch, under the title *La petite Sainte Thérèse*. Nothing on the saint except her own writings has been so widely read.[1]

In France, Van der Meersch's book was hailed as a triumph. Writing in an incisive style, he knew how to put color and drama into the picture. With obvious sincerity and—so it appeared to some—mastery of the sources, he composed a canticle of praise, a magnificent ode to the saint. Many of his pages are truly beautiful, touched with glowing admiration. The book was read by believers and unbelievers alike, becoming a best-seller. Never, it seemed, had Thérèse been better known.

Van der Meersch speaks of his heroine with great respect. He goes so far as to say that he wrote of her on his knees. He was, however, convinced that her previous biographers had misunderstood her holiness and he determined at the risk of being accused of impiety and sacrilege to reveal the true Thérèse—for him a personality of gigantic stature. He wanted to present her as she really was, without all the plaster-of-Paris pose which disfigures her commonly accepted portrait. He would not make her face more beautiful nor her soul sweeter or more feminine than it appears in

[1] Helen Fiske Evans, *The Garden of the Little Flower* (New York, 1947). This strange book combines devotion to St. Thérèse with anti-Catholicism. Ida Frederike Goerres, *Das verborgene Antlitz* (Freiburg-im-Breisgau, 2nd ed., 1946). Maxence van der Meersch, *La petite Sainte Thérèse* (Paris 1947). M. van der Meersch died suddenly early this year.

the sources. Although a novelist he professed scrupulous regard for the facts. Van der Meersch seemed to have succeeded. In his books early critics found the truth about the saint, about the Carmel of Lisieux and even about Carmels in general. Unfortunately nothing could be further from the truth than this initial enthusiasm. Serious critics, who knew the life and teachings of Thérèse, pointed to serious defects in the work. In endeavoring to present a true picture, they maintained, the novelist had deformed the saint more than ever before—albeit in a novel way.

In his description of the childhood of Thérèse, Van der Meersch makes details taken from the saint's writings tell the story. In scenes full of life, the entourage is sketched in. But the novelist's thesis leads him to make Thérèse a vain and obstinate child, violent, choleric, full of self-love. To support this view, he resorts to the well-known trick of relating exceptional events as if they were habitual and characteristic. Against the evidence he makes out that Thérèse was a spoiled child. Her coquetry and impatience are exaggerated. On her trip to Rome she is painted as an irritating busybody, a real *enfant terrible*.

In reality, Thérèse was neither vain nor violent. She seemed quite unaware of her beauty, never exaggerating in matters of dress and not using perfume. She used mirrors only when they were necessary, while admiring looks and words had little effect on her. In her humility she did not prefer herself to others.

The saint had, undoubtedly, her share of will power. But all the evidence is against the headstrong creation Van der Meersch tries to pass off as Thérèse. As a child as well as afterwards, a word was enough to make her see her mistakes and correct them. The novelist's account of the trip to Rome is based on an untrustworthy source and abounds in errors and exaggerations. The best proof of this last point is perhaps the attitude of the Abbé Révérony, vicar general of Bayeux, who made the trip charged by his bishop to observe this girl who wanted to become a Carmelite at fifteen. On his return M. Révérony was in favor of the immediate entrance of Thérèse.[2]

[2] Cf. *La petite Sainte Thérèse de Maxence van der Meersch devant la critique et devant les textes.* Introduction by André Combes (Paris, 1950). This excellent work, on which this study is based, will be described below. For the saint's childhood, see pp. 285-99.

The picture that Van der Meersch gives of Thérèse's life as a Carmelite is much more distorted than his account of her youth. According to him, the religious life of the saint involved her in a double conflict: interior and exterior.

The interior struggle is her conquest of sanctity as Van der Meersch understands it. Thérèse desired to become a great saint, understanding sanctity as moral perfection. According to the novelist she was soon disillusioned since she found that human nature is invincibly evil. Then came her great discovery: true sanctity consists in recognizing and admitting human incapacity for moral perfection, without at the same time giving up the struggle. The sanctity of Thérèse consists in an immense effort of introspection by which she realized that she was bad, vile, cruel, egotistical. But she never lied about it: she admitted her vileness to herself. She knew that in her struggle for moral perfection defeat was inevitable. This did not worry her. The conflict counts, not victory. Her life was simply a long effort without achievement, a prolonged defeat borne with patience. The saint's message to sinners is, in the novelist's opinion, this dissociation of moral perfection and sanctity. The worst sinners can be saints (remaining sinners) provided they admit their weakness. Sin is an evil but impatience with sin is a greater evil.

Van der Meersch did not hesitate to apply his theory to Thérèse and to all the saints. Saints are simply those who do not ask to be cured, who humbly accept and bear with their moral misery. Perfection is an impossible dream. Sanctity can coexist with all kinds of moral perversion. Van der Meersch's doctrine on this point has rightly been characterized as a mixture of Socratic morality and Lutheran pessimism. The assertion that this theory and not heroic virtue explains the saints is, obviously, a grave error. Certainly Van der Meersch misrepresents Thérèse in order to force her into this mould.[3]

The novelist maintains that psychologically the saint produced an immense effort of introspection. She never tired in her determination to see herself clearly, not to lie to herself, to know herself.

[3] This dissociation of moral perfection and sanctity was somewhat veiled in M. van der Meersch's *La petite Sainte Thérèse* but appeared very clearly in his article *Il y a cinquante ans, Thérèse Martin*, published in the French weekly *Carrefour* for Oct. 1, 1947.

She laid bare even the subtlest expressions of self-love. Two thousand years after Socrates and without having read a line of Plato, she proves herself their disciple by driving her egoism into the open.

That there is an element of truth in this cannot of course be denied. Thérèse did have the grace to recognize her nothingness and her human misery; but it is quite false to attribute this to an immense effort and above all to make all her spiritual struggle consist in it. As a matter of fact, Thérèse like all the masters of the spiritual life was unalterably opposed to any excess of introspection. She urged her novices to forget themselves and strive to love God. She condemned self-occupation as sterile and recommended to those tempted in this way to turn to works of charity.[4]

When Van der Meersch contends that the spiritual life of Thérèse was a complete shipwreck—heroic struggle and continual defeat—and that at her death the saint was aware that she was morally where she had been when she began, his error is incredible. He misunderstands his heroine about as thoroughly as one knowing the sources could.

St. Thérèse was one of the most angelic creatures that this sinful world has ever known. Reared in a saintly family and prevented by extraordinary graces, she not only never committed a serious sin or a deliberate venial sin, but, according to testimony given during the process of canonization was never guilty of a deliberate imperfection. Her obedience was constant and heroic, she indulged in no idle words, never wasted a minute, never failed in charity, never violated a rule of her order, never appeared to be in bad humor, never satisfied even legitimate curiosity, and always did what she considered most perfect. She was faithful in everything.[5]

It is true that even till the end of her life the saint often spoke of her numberless imperfections. Two observations are in order here. First, her companions in the Carmel at Lisieux never remarked them. Second, she was not speaking of difficulty in the way of virtue which arises from personal sins since she had not committed deliberate sin. She did, however, have temptations (ex-

[4] *La petite Sainte Thérèse de Maxence van der Meersch devant la critique et devant les textes*, pp. 415 ff.

[5] *Op. cit.*, pp. 420 ff.

cept against purity) and in general she had to struggle against the tendencies of our fallen nature. She had to overcome instinctive repugnances and weariness: milk nauseated her, beans gave her a stomach-ache and she had a great dislike for spiders. She often lacked full clarity in her trials. She felt failure, indelicate remarks, unfair reproaches. She had to make an effort not to lean when seated and to put up with cold. She felt importunate interruptions. She suffered from dryness in prayer. The mental illness of her father was a severe blow to her loving heart. In short, she had a real struggle and she wanted it known that she did.[6]

The life of Thérèse, then, was not a primrose path to glory; but she maintained a standard of perfection which clearly justified her early canonization. She was, too, well aware of this and not the least conscious of any shipwreck of her hopes. In intimate conversation with her sisters during her last illness, she admitted that her spirit was bright and golden because illumined by rays of love from the Divine Sun, that her soul was entirely clothed with love, that she was enriched with all the divine treasures, that her heart was filled with the will of God and that God had loaded her with graces for herself and others. She was convinced that the whole world would know and love her. Finally despite her mission to teach and practice the ordinary way of faith, Thérèse was favored with mystical graces of exceptional power and great rarity.[7]

Van der Meersch, who had the misfortune to grow up as a materialist, found his literary inspiration in the harsh realism of Zola. Before beginning the study of Thérèse, he had evolved in the direction of the invisible realities of Christianity, it is true, but he was ever more adept in depicting sinners than saints. Unprepared as he unquestionably was to understand the spiritual genius of Lisieux, it is, nevertheless, more than a little surprising to find that he had turned her into a Lutheran. To do so he had to misunderstand completely Christian humility and the spiritual career of Thérèse.[8]

[6] *Op. cit.*, pp. 429 ff.

[7] *Novissima verba, The Last Conversations of St. Thérèse* (New York, 1929). For the saint's awareness of God's goodness to her, cf. conversations of July 25, Aug. 1, 4, 6, 8, 9, and 12. For mystical gifts, cf. July 7 and 11.

[8] *Etudes* (April, 1951) has a study of Van der Meersch as a novelist by Louis Barjon, pp. 1-20.

To balance her interior failure, M. van der Meersch makes Thérèse victorious in an exterior struggle which he invents for the purpose. The novelist perceives in the Carmel of Lisieux little preoccupation with spiritual things, little concern with prayer and not even the rudiments of the religious spirit. With five of six exceptions, the nuns are in his mind leagued in relentless warfare against his warrior maiden who fights heroically against the strange surroundings in which she finds herself. Her fellow Carmelites are cruel to the death. Mediocre, torn by party spirit and obsessed by convent politics, they show themselves cowardly, feeble, peevish, scolding, exigent and worse. Their leader is a bizarre and hateful Prioress who is animated by bitter animosity against Thérèse and all her family.

Van der Meersch's historical errors are almost as serious as his doctrinal aberrations. As a matter of fact the Carmel of Lisieux at the time Thérèse lived in it was distinguished by more than ordinary austerity. There were, indeed, some failures in silence, religious exactitude, and charity but not much, if any, more than what must be expected even in the case of virtuous and fervent religious. Not all the Carmelites of Lisieux were cultured women, or even possessed of a good education, but their religious ideal was kept clearly in view and their difficult rule was in general faithfully followed. Indeed, one of Van der Meersch's complaints is that too much austerity was demanded of Thérèse.

That the nuns of Lisieux were leagued against the saint and her sisters is quite false. On the contrary they esteemed Thérèse as they did no one else. Her simplicity and humility hid, it is true, the sublimity of her life. Her regularity, of course, especially in the beginning, was obvious enough to render some of her companions a little cold to her—as if she were just another young religious who fancied her own way of doing things—but there was no real opposition or animosity. Thérèse was neither persecuted nor overwhelmed with affection. She was loved because she was charming and once she was put in charge of the novices she exercised a discreet influence on the spirituality of the monastery. She was merry and witty in recreation where it was felt that her gaiety came from interior joy. She could tell a story and was a good mimic. There was never any repellent austerity about her. She remained gracious and childlike to the

end. She excelled as a peacemaker. As far as the government of the monastery was concerned, she was self-effacing. The same was true when the conversation turned in recreation on spiritual doctrine. The saint preferred to stay out of both. In the course of time the community got used to her regularity and it was only on reflection that some noted her altogether exceptional perfection. She was far from wanting to pass as a reformer. Thérèse herself summed up the attitude of her fellow Carmelites as one of exceptional devotedness and tenderness.[9]

The Prioress, Mother Marie de Gonzague, who, except for the years 1893-96, was the religious superior of the saint, was clearly an energetic woman of good counsel. Much loved by her religious, she was elected Prioress seven times. This did not mean that she had no defects. She could be touchy, changeable and impulsive. She was somewhat preoccupied with her family and at one time quite attached to a cat. She seems, too, not to have been careful enough of silence and religious exactitude. Despite these faults she was far from being the hateful enemy of Thérèse Van der Meersch has created. The contrary is the truth: she loved and esteemed the saint who repaid her in kind. Mother Marie de Gonzague recognized the spiritual stature of Thérèse almost from their earliest acquaintance. She did not, it is true, consider her as canonizable but she did realize that Thérèse was unusually holy. As Prioress she received the saint into the community before the normal age and against the advice of the ecclesiastical superior of the monastery. And this—despite the prior membership of two sisters of Thérèse. In judging her as a novice, Mother Marie de Gonzague asserted that Thérèse was a treasure of Carmel, the best of her good religious, an angel, perfect in every way. On the occasion of the saint's profession, the Prioress wrote to the Carmelites of Tours that Thérèse was a perfect religious. She also affirmed repeatedly that the saint, despite her youth, was worthy to be prioress in preference to all the other religious.

It is true that at the beginning of her religious life, Thérèse

[9] Père Noché in *La petite Sainte Thérèse de Maxence van der Meersch devant la critique et devant les textes*, pp. 300-50 examines the attitude of each of the religious of Lisieux to the saint. Scarcely an element of the novelist's picture survives. Père Noché's work is based on the best sources, many of them hitherto inaccessible.

was treated with some severity. Those who understand the ordinary usages in the formation of young religious will not be surprised by this. The saint afterwards reminded her superior of it with gratitude. But as time went on the Prioress and Thérèse became good friends—so much so that in difficult hours the older woman sought support and solace from the younger.[10]

The great charge against Mother Marie de Gonzague arises from her treatment of Thérèse during the early stages of her last illness. Here adjectives fail the accusers of the Prioress. She is charged with unconscious ferocity, with diabolical self-deceit, with waging a cold war on the "little martyr who courageously undergoes a silent agony" and dies rather than submit to the Prioress by asking for proper care.

The fact is, of course, that Thérèse did not receive treatment suited to a tubercular patient. In the 1890's the disease was still a mystery to physicians as well as to the uninitiate. But in this respect the saint was no more unfortunate than any contemporary victims of the disease. Once her malady was diagnosed, Mother Marie de Gonzague spared no expense. Thérèse had continuous and, for the time, excellent medical attention. Not only the community doctor but a physician connected with the Martin family cared for her. During the last five months, the saint's own sisters were her nurses. The superior of the Little Flower had nothing on her conscience as a result of her treatment of the saint in her last illness. On the contrary Thérèse was overwhelmed by her goodness.[11]

[10] Notably on the occasion of the contested election for Prioress in 1896. Cf. *Collected Letters of Saint Thérèse of Lisieux*, edited by Abbé Combes, translated by F. J. Sheed (New York, 1949), pp. 269-74. After the saint's death, Mother Marie de Gonzague wrote in the register of the Convent: "A perfect model of humility, charity, prudence, detachment and regularity, she [Thérèse] fulfilled the difficult discipline of Mistress of Novices with sagacity and affection which nothing could equal save her love of God." Père Noché studies the relations of the saint and her superior in *La petite Sainte Thérèse* . . . pp. 351-77, again demolishing the constructions of Van der Meersch.

[11] This may seem a strong statement in view of the serious charges made by many against the Prioress but anyone who reads Père Noché's solidly documented study (pp. 378-406), will be forced to agree. Even the celebrated hemoptysis of April 3, 1896, when studied in the circumstances and taking

Van der Meersch, led astray by certain remarks of his predecessors, has seriously misrepresented the whole affair. And this judgment applies not only to the final illness but also to the treatment accorded the saint by her superiors. The novelist's description of the Carmel of Lisieux as a community without fervor or the spirit of love and with a superior who lacked charity and balance is as false as it well could be.

When we realize how far Van der Meersch was from the truth in his portrait of Thérèse, we naturally wonder why his book was so favorably received in France and especially why qualified reviewers hailed its appearance.[12]

It is not hard to account for the popular acclaim. Although Maxence van der Meersch may not have been, as some have maintained, *the* great French novelist of recent years, he did have a definite literary gift: he was able through the creations of his pen to stir the emotions of his readers. His style is living, genuine, direct. In presenting his Thérèse he unquestionably reveals a personality. Unfortunately that person is not Thérèse of Lisieux. Van der Meersch's own personality was too strong to permit him to be objective. The general reading public could not be expected to perceive this.

Able reviewers were taken in by the novelist partly for the same reason and partly because in his *La petite Sainte Thérèse* the novelist adroitly veiled his thesis. Indeed not infrequently in his pages the true doctrine and the false are juxtaposed with little or no attempt at reconciliation: the former in the very words of Thérèse, the latter in the explanation added by Van der Meersch. The reviewers in question thought they were justified in interpreting the novelist's aberrations in an orthodox manner. Unfortunately for them, in an article in a French review Van der Meersch soon re-

---

into consideration the reaction of the physician loses its importance. It is worthy of note that Van der Meersch as vigorously condemns the Bishop as the Prioress.

[12] Père Robert Rouquette wrote favorably in *Etudes* (1947), 246-61, thanking Van der Meersch for having written the book and remarking in passing that no one had been able to exculpate Mother Marie de Gonzague and her clan. Pierre Blanchard in *L'Année théologique* (1948), p. 67, writes: "M van der Meersch nous a lancé un message qui prolonge celui de Thérèse et l'approfondit."

vealed his hand only too clearly. There his erroneous opinions were presented in a particularly crude form. There could no longer be any doubt.[13]

A further reason, and perhaps the most important, why some informed French Catholics were deceived arose from certain writings which had prepared the way for Van der Meersch. The most important of these, and the only one we shall treat here, was an article on St. Thérèse published in 1926 in an obscure Catalan review by Père Ubald, like the saint a native of Alençon, and baptized a few days before her in the same Church. Père Ubald was interested in his famous compatriot and, having access to the records of the canonization process, the *Summarium*, he read them avidly but not too wisely. In his little work *Ste. Thérèse comme je la connais*, he exploited his ill-digested knowledge in a journalistic manner. It was he who created the busybody of the trip to Rome and formulated the thesis of the hateful Marie de Gonzague and her clan persecuting the little martyr of Lisieux.[14]

Canon P. T. Duboscq, the *advocatus diaboli* in the process of canonization, wrote a refutation of Père Ubald. Despite this competent pamphlet rumors about the martyrdom of Thérèse spread far and wide. The charges concerned with the early life of the saint were judged to have been disproved, but it was widely held that Mother Marie de Gonzague had been lacking in her duty and guilty of great injustice to the saint. Such charges were not infrequently bandied about in religious circles even in the United States. Van der Meersch made himself the loudspeaker of these opinions. Before him they had been heard in the storerooms, he broadcast them from the housetops.[15]

[13] *Carrefour*, Oct. 1, 1947, *Il y a cinquante ans, Thérèse Martin.*

[14] Père Ubald's article is accessible in the reprint by Lucie Delarue-Mardrus in her *La petite Thérèse de Lisieux* (Paris, 1937).

[15] It is pleasant to note that once Van der Meersch's errors had been pointed out to him he hastened to make amends, at least in the doctrinal field, in an article which also appeared in *Carrefour*, this time in the issue of February 11, 1948, under the title: *Dieu m'a fait la faveur d'être lu.* In this article the novelist tries to save his previous writings on St. Thérèse but does so only by denying his whole previous position. The fact that the Carmel of Lisieux did not open its archives to refute the picture painted by Père Ubald does present a bit of a problem. No doubt the religious considered that the refutation would bring the charges to the attention of

An answer was imperative and in due time it appeared. In one of the most important books yet published on St. Thérèse, *La petite Sainte Thérèse de Maxence van der Meersch devant la critique et devant les textes,* the case is examined in detail and with all necessary guarantees. This volume contains the outstanding criticisms of the novel—among them a dispassionate discussion by Padre Cordovani, Master of the Sacred Palace—and a lengthy study of the charges of Van der Mersch and the others from the pen of Père André Noché. With complete mastery of the published sources and of the *Summarium* and after careful consultation with the surviving witnesses, Père Noché describes the monastery of Lisieux and shows how unfounded are the charges against it and its long-time superior, Marie de Gonzague. In doing so he throws much new light on the gracious personality and shining perfection of the saint.

In terminating this brief study which has passed over much of interest, it will not be amiss to point a moral. The errors of Père Ubald and Van der Meersch stress the importance, in writing of the saints, not only of consulting authoritative documents but also of interpreting them correctly. The medieval lives often obscured the saints by an overdose of the miraculous. Modern writers are not infrequently totally unprepared to understand the conduct of the saints, let alone their spiritual teaching. If in addition such authors happen to possess a strong personality, they remake the saints in their own image and likeness. St. Francis of Assisi has long suffered from this type of admirer. We probably have not seen the last misrepresentation of St. Thérèse.

For one thing we can be grateful to Maxence van der Meersch: for bringing the false views on the Carmel of Lisieux and its glory to public notice. By so doing he provoked the volume on which this study is based. It takes its place with the *Autobiography, Letters, Novissima verba* of the saint and with *L'Esprit de Ste. Thérèse de l'Enfant Jésus* by the Carmelites of Lisieux as a source of primary importance for the study of a personality whom Blessed

---

many who would otherwise never hear of them. Furthermore these constructions very probably seemed to the nuns of Lisieux not to merit serious attention.

Pius X characterized as one of the greatest saints of modern times.[16]

EDWARD A. RYAN, S.J.

Woodstock College,
Woodstock, Maryland

[16] Shortly before her death, St. Thérèse gave her sister, Mother Agnès de Jésus permission to edit her works, changing anything which she thought should be changed. It is clear since the publication of the *Letters* of the saint in their entirety and especially since the appearance of Père Nocheé's study that this permission was used only to spare the feelings of people who were connected with the saint. Since with the lapse of time and the canonization of Thérèse this reason has lost its force, a critical edition of the *Autobiography* and of the very valuable *Novissima verba* is looked for.

THE MYSTICAL BODY A LIVING ORGANISM

St. Paul presented the Mystical Body as a living organism, with each organized part contributing its particular action for the good of the whole. Moreover this body has been organized in such a way that the life, coming from the Head, is transmitted to the members through the definite hierarchy of sacred power, which is constituted radically by the character of Holy Orders. Hence the action of the lesser parts of the Body is necessarily subordinate to the sacred hierarchy to whom primarily and formally had been entrusted Christ's priestly mission of teaching governing and sanctifying. It follows that the apostolate of those hierarchically subordinated members will itself be *hierarchically subordinated,* and will follow the organized nature of the life of the Body. The very definition of Catholic Action indicates this. It is "the participation of the laity in the apostolate of the hierarchy." In stressing that Catholic Action is a true apostolate, Pius XI ever emphasized that it is subordinate to the apostolate of the hierarchy. "Precisely because it is an apostolate, Catholic Action does not only procure greater sanctification of its members, but tends also to the greater sanctification of others by means of the *organized* action of Catholics who follow in all things the direction given by the Hierarchy."

—Theodore M. Hesburgh, C.S.C., in *The Relation of the Sacramental Characters of Baptism and Confirmation to the Lay Apostolate* (Washington, D. C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1946), pp. 159 f.

A LEGION OF DECENCY PROGRAM

The subject of this paper is the development and application of a diocesan Legion of Decency program in the Diocese of Buffalo under Bishops Turner, Duffy and O'Hara.

The movie situation in the city of Buffalo is similar to that in many other cities. There are half a dozen large theaters in the downtown section that monopolize the first run of films and a number of neighborhood theaters in the residential sections that get the second and subsequent runs. In the smaller cities and towns outside the See city there are also some first-run houses.

Shortly after the bishops of the United States launched the National Legion of Decency in 1934, Bishop Turner appointed a diocesan director to organize a Buffalo Council of the Legion. The director soon decided that absolutely the first essential step in this type of work would be the publication of a list of classified pictures. Various Catholic groups were using various sources of reviews. The Sodality Movement was classifying pictures mostly on the basis of a trade paper, *Harrison's Reports;* the Chicago Legion of Decency was making up its own reviews; the International Federation of Catholic Alumnae (hereinafter *IFCA*) continued to publish its lists of approved pictures as it had done for years previous to the inauguration of the Legion of Decency. At times there were bitter differences of opinion over the classification of pictures, especially "condemned" ones. The Buffalo Council, after surveying the situation thoroughly, decided to publish a monthly list based upon the IFCA releases, but supplemented from other sources when necessary, and containing only recommended pictures: recommended for general or family audiences, and recommended for adults. This list was revised monthly in accordance with the films that were showing locally and was sent out to all the schools and theaters of the diocese. In addition, a special list covering the first-run pictures in the downtown houses was published weekly in the local Catholic newspapers.

Preparing these lists in the chaotic situation then existing was a major headache, but the task was faithfully performed for nearly two years.

The IFCA had followed the policy of not publishing the titles of rejected pictures, much less the reasons for the rejections; also of not listing pictures morally unobjectionable, but of poor entertainment value. These policies made it extremely difficult to draw up a comprehensive list intelligently, and the Buffalo Council successfully waged an epistolary campaign first, to get information about pictures rejected on moral grounds, and secondly, to have included in the published lists titles of pictures that might be of poor entertainment value but were otherwise unobjectionable. As a result of the correspondence, the Buffalo Council was thereafter furnished with information on rejected pictures, and the national IFCA lists began to include *all* unobjectionable films. In the final and current resolution of the Decency list, it will be noted, both these policies are in evidence: all feature films are judged on the basis of moral issues only, and the reason is given for each rejection.

Which brings us a litle ahead of our story, for the present most satisfactory situation was not arrived at without some travail. In November of 1934 the American Bishops at their annual meeting in Washington decided that the Chicago list should be recommended as the official list throughout the country: and thus the valiant IFCA, which had been reviewing pictures intelligently and consistently over a number of years, was left gasping high and dry on the shoals of seeming disapproval. But there were various indications that the problem had not been permanently settled; and Buffalo, along with a few others, continued to use the IFCA listings.

Meanwhile, and subsequently, along these and similar lines, a number of articles emanated from Buffalo on the national front,[1] whilst a column of comment was intermittently published in the local Catholic papers.

[1] "What Next, Legion of Decency?" *Commonweal*, Jan. 11, 1935; "Legion of Decency and Clean Pictures," *Ave Maria*, Feb. 22, 1936; "I. F. C. A. M. P. B.," *The Acolyte*, Feb. 16, March 2, March 16, March 30, 1935; "Family Programs or Legal Bridle Called Exhibitors' Alternative," *Motion Picture Herald*, March 28, 1936; "A Claque for Decency," *The Acolyte*, August, 1936; "B Means Bad," *Our Sunday Visitor*, Aug. 29, 1943; "But I Couldn't See Anything Wrong," *Ibid.*, Oct. 10, 1943; "How About that Pledge?" *Ibid.*, Dec. 3, 1943; "Advertising B Pictures," *Ave Maria*, Nov. 6, 1943; "A Movie Prescription," *The Victorian*, March, 1945; "One List at Last," *Our Sunday Visitor*, Nov. 27, 1949.

A number of things that the Buffalo Council advocated have since come to pass:

(1) A single, national list of recommended and rejected pictures.

(2) Adoption of the IFCA Motion Picture Bureau as the official Legion of Decency reviewers.

(3) Publication of reasons for rejecting pictures.

(4) Inclusion of *all* movies, however lacking in artistic or technical merits, in the national list.

(5) A national column highlighting the moral content of films: a task now being admirably performed by William H. Mooring in his syndicated column, "Hollywood in Focus."

(6) Segregation of latest reviews from the general list, to facilitate typing and filing.

(7) Publication under one alphabetical listing of all pictures previously reviewed: now available for all reviews from February, 1936, to November, 1948, at the National Legion of Decency office.

In all these developments Bishop Turner supported the Legion activities with enthusiasm, and allowed its director full liberty of judgment at a time when some of the controversial issues were hotly debated.

Under Bishop Duffy in 1941 a movement originating in the Catholic high schools of the diocese resulted in approval of a Scholastic Legion of Decency. Committees were appointed in each particular school, and they proceeded to post lists of classified pictures on the school bulletin boards, paying particular attention to the first-run, downtown pictures. The committees also met, and continue to meet, once a month at some central point, where various details and items of information are discussed and items of general policy are ironed out.

These young people have demonstrated a great deal of vigor and enthusiasm. For one instance, members of a particular committee went one week to a nearby parochial school and pinned a note to the clothing of all first and second graders, advising their parents that a picture showing over the weekend in a certain neighborhood theater was objectionable! On another occasion the youngsters solved rather radically a recurrent problem: when may high school students be considered sufficiently mature to see the A-2 (Unobjectionable for Adults) films? The teen-agers simply

decided to patronize only A-1 (Unobjectionable for General Patronage) pictures.

In the spring of 1948, under Bishop O'Hara, it was decided to make the Legion of Decency program more immediately effective in the parochial schools. The diocesan superintendent of schools sent out a survey sheet to all the parochial schools of the diocese. On the other side of the sheet was placed the following:

EXPLANATION

The purpose of this survey is to learn the movie-going habits of the children in our elementary schools.

COLUMN I — Write the name, address and manager of all the neighborhood theaters which have been mentioned by the children in the school as theaters which some regularly attend. The name of the manager should be secured, if possible, because an explanatory letter will be sent to each.

COLUMN II — Not all neighborhood theaters have matinee performances on Saturday afternoon. We want to find out how many theaters are open on Saturday afternoon.

COLUMN III, IV, V — We want to find out how many children in the first, second and third grade group go to movies and when; the same for the 4th, 5th and 6th grade group and also for the 7th and 8th grade group. As the code indicates, "R" means that the child goes to the movies regularly on that night or afternoon: i.e., at least three times per month. "O" means he goes occasionally, once per month or less. However, he may only go occasionally on Friday night but regularly every Saturday afternoon and occasionally on Sunday afternoons. He should be included in the figures for Friday, Saturday and Sunday.

COLUMN VI — This is to be used when the survey in the school shows a number of children going to the movies at times other than Friday nights, and Saturday and Sunday afternoons. Exact figures may not always be possible, in which case the estimate of the classroom teacher, who is the best judge of the habits of her pupils, is to be accepted.

N. B. The Lenten movie habits of the children are not under inspection in this study. Emphasize that we want to know about their movie-going outside of Lent. The procedure for making the survey in each school is described in the Teacher's Bulletin.

The Legion of Decency director had seen from the very beginning the importance of weekends, especially matinees, in the matter of children's movie habits. He tried several times to do something about the quality of programs scheduled for Sundays: but he found that theater managers looked upon Sundays as their most important and profitable days, and that it was practically impossible to demand a certain type of picture for those days. The sum philosophy of the exhibitors seemed to be: "What pictures shown upon our best day will produce the best revenue?" Hence, it was decided to emphasize Fridays and Saturdays, which were also known to be favorite attendance days for children, as days upon which only A-1, or general patronage pictures, should be shown. (In neighborhood or smaller town theaters the most frequent distribution of programs is as follows: one program for Sunday, Monday and Tuesday; another for Wednesday and Thursday; still another for Friday and Saturday.)

The principal purpose of the survey above described was to obtain more exact knowledge about the days on which the children frequented the theaters most.

While this survey was being made, the local Legion of Decency files, containing all the classifications of the central organization since its inception, plus other classifications from other sources dating to several years before the inauguration of the national organization, were duplicated in the diocesan school office. It may be of interest here to reproduce one of these cards.

Dec. 9, 1943

CROSS OF LORRAINE, THE	B	OBJ
MGM		NLD

Objection: Excessive brutality.

The date of review is placed on top so that if a given file drawer becomes full, the oldest titles may be easily taken out and placed in a second drawer. The classification is repeated twice (B, OBJ) as a double check upon accurate copying. MGM denotes the producer, NLD the source of the review. Ordinary 3 x 5 filing cards are used. (Through the years this master file has "earned its board"

a hundred times over. The recent publication by the National Legion of Decency in a single volume, in a single alphabetical order, of all titles reviewed up to Nov., 1948, was a great boon to those who had not kept previous reviews on file. It is advisable, however, to file away the newer titles and reviews as soon as they come out: otherwise one spends a great deal of time in going through individual lists and accumulations of lists.)

The results of the survey were most interesting. For instance, it was found that in twenty city schools, with a combined registration of 9,518, seventy-nine per cent went to the movies regularly. Of these regular "patrons," 20 per cent went Friday night, 25 per cent Saturday afternoon, 42 per cent Sunday afternoon, and 13 per cent at all other times. Again, of the regular attendants, 38 per cent were in grades 1, 2 and 3; 35 per cent in grades 4, 5 and 6; 27 per cent were in grades 7 and 8. In other words, 73 per cent of those who saw the films regularly were in the sixth grade or under.

Another thing that stands out in the survey is that by far the majority of the children patronize the smaller, neighborhood houses.

Meanwhile, in the *Teachers' Bulletin* of the Diocese some explicit instructions were given:

> The Legion of Decency Committee in each school is to be composed of three eighth grade pupils (five if two or more classes) who are appointed by the eighth grade teacher(s) with the approval of the principal. The committee should select its own chairman. Its duties will be to keep in contact with the manager of the theater assigned to the school, secure the schedule of pictures at least two weeks in advance of showing, secure the official Legion of Decency rating of each picture, publicize the information in its own school, and send it to other schools in the neighborhood when such is requested by the Diocesan Office.
>
> A Master File of classifications has been made and placed in the Diocesan Office of the School Department. When the committee members cannot find the classification of a picture, the Principal or Faculty Adviser, *NOT the pupils*,[2] may call the School Department and ask for the information from the Master File. The location of this source of information should not be made generally known. This service is

[2] This was so strongly stipulated to prevent the School Department office from being swamped with telephone calls sent in by enthusiastic junior legionnaires.

intended only for priests, sisters and brothers who are in a position to bring the information to larger groups. The School Department is in no position to give this service to the general public. The file will always be kept up to the latest weekly release of the Legion of Decency.

Shortly a letter was sent out to all the schools, as follows:

Dear Sister:

X . . . Theater has been assigned to your school. The procedure to be acted upon immediately is as follows:

1. Write a note to the manager of this theater introducing the committee members, who will deliver the note in person. Sign your name as principal.

2. Instruct the committee members on their presentation to the manager. They should emphasize the fact that more than 50,000 boys and girls in the schools of the Diocese of Buffalo are requesting the cooperation of those in the movie industry in making and presenting good pictures; that a similar committee is meeting with the manager of every theater in Buffalo and Western New York with the same message; that only A-1 pictures should be shown on Friday evenings and Saturday afternoons; that a list of all pictures scheduled to be shown at his theater should be given them one month in advance, or at least two weeks; that these titles will be checked against the Legion of Decency list and all defections will be brought to his attention; that the school will publicize the movies with notations for the pupils whether they are approved or not approved; that the information of Legion of Decency ratings on all his pictures will be carried by the children to their homes for the guidance of their parents and the adult members of the family.

3. Theater managers schedule or "buy" pictures about one month in advance. It is important that the committee get this information, but pictures should be classified on the bulletin board only one week in advance. If the Legion of Decency lists on file in the school do not have the rating of a specific picture, the principal should be notified, and she should call the diocesan school office, MA 2145.

4. If a theater does not supply the lists as requested, or frequently shows A-2 or B pictures on Friday nights and Saturday afternoons, or frequently shows C pictures at other times, the diocesan office should be notified in writing by the chairman of the committee. The committee should keep a record of all pictures shown, and the rating of each.

5. Our survey showed that children from as many as ten schools attend some theaters. It is IMPORTANT that the committees in these schools receive the list of pictures and the ratings of each. If other schools attend your movie theater, the list of names of those schools

is attached to this letter. Your committee should contact personally, if possible, the committees in each of these schools. A meeting could be arranged with the respective principals of the other schools if there were more than two or three, and plans could be made for seeing that they received the necessary information completely and promptly.

6. Pastors should be asked to post the listings and ratings of neighborhood theater programs in the vestibule of the church.

As in all programs, the value of this one depends on the cooperation of all the Sisters. The committee can do all the work, but the attitude must be developed by the teachers. Unless the managers see that the children are not attending unapproved pictures, the effectiveness of the program will be lost. They must also be made to understand that their adult patronage is affected by non-compliance with our requests. The Catholic children and their families in the Diocese of Buffalo are strong enough to demand respect for the Legion of Decency, and the theaters in Western New York are strong enough to exert considerable pressure on Hollywood for good pictures. If this program is successful here, I am sure that other Catholic school systems will adopt it. Because Catholics are urban people to a large extent and the movie industry depends principally upon urban audiences, we could clean up one of the serious moral and social menaces in our country and in the world.

Sincerely yours . . .

Simultaneously with this communication, another letter was sent out to the schools which did not have a theater assigned them. These schools were advised that they would be contacted by the schools assigned to theaters which were patronized by their pupils.

In the fall of 1949 several instances arose which seemed to indicate a certain amount of confusion and lack of coordination. In one case, a pastor vigorously denounced from the pulpit a picture which had originally been condemned, but was later revised and subsequently placed in Class B. In another instance, a Scholastic Legion of Decency committee swamped a neighborhood theater with protests over a Class B picture being shown on Sunday. This film likewise had been in Class C, had received a good bit of notoriety, and had retained its bad odor in the nostrils of the public even after its revision and reclassification.

This latter development opened a window. Was it possible that the Legion of Decency, through the vigorous action and

thorough coverage of its junior offshoots, could do something to influence the quality of the Sunday programs? A round table discussion a couple of hours in length ensued. Taking part in it were the Legion of Decency director, the superintendent of Catholic schools, the moderator of the Scholastic Legion of Decency (who is also the diocesan youth director), and an experienced and influential exhibitor of proven good will. The latter was called in so that the issues would be settled with due consideration for the practical possibilities involved.

From this lengthy discussion there resulted the following:

CLARIFICATION OF POLICIES

Buffalo Council, Legion of Decency

The Buffalo Council tries to publicize as much as possible the classification of pictures issued by the National Legion of Decency. The director thereof maintains a complete file of all classified pictures, which file is duplicated in the office of the Department of Education of the Diocese of Buffalo.

The Buffalo Council is the general clearing house for information, details, particular application of policies, etc.

The Buffalo Council will protest through all available channels—correspondence, the press, the pulpit, schools, parish organizations, etc.—the showing of a Class C picture anywhere in the diocese. It will not protest the showing of Class B pictures. If the classification of a picture is changed from Class C to Class B, the Buffalo Council will forthwith withdraw its protest against the showing of the film.

The only exception to the above may occur when a Class C picture is shown in one of the smaller downtown Buffalo theaters. In such a case the Buffalo Council may not protest the showing for the following reasons: (a) these pictures in such smaller theaters are mostly foreign and so of very limited audience appeal; (b) a general protest always arouses interest in a minor fringe of the population, and this interest might be enough to fill these smaller theaters for several weeks. However, if a C picture thus shown in a smaller downtown theater is scheduled for a neighborhood theater, the Buffalo Council will at once protest its showing in that neighborhood.

The Buffalo Council, through its advisory committee, will keep in touch with all current motion picture developments by attending previews, meetings of allied organizations, etc.

Junior Legion of Decency

The Junior Legion of Decency is composed of the children in parochial schools.

Acting along lines set up by the Diocesan Department of Education, it will classify the pictures showing in the local neighborhood theaters and post lists thereof in all the parochial schools.

It will endeavor to obtain and support junior matinees in the various neighborhood theaters. It will insist that at such matinees only A-1 pictures be shown. It will look upon all Saturday afternoon performances as junior matinees. It will endeavor to get only A pictures—whether A-1 or A-2—shown on Sundays, when family audiences are in such great predominance in the theaters. It will consequently protest the showing of B pictures in the neighborhood theaters on Sundays.

Scholastic Legion of Decency

The Scholastic Legion of Decency is composed of the students in the Catholic High Schools of the diocese.

Acting along lines set up in the Catholic Youth Office, it will classify pictures showing in the downtown theaters and post lists thereof in all the Catholic High Schools.

After due consultation with the principals in each case, it will offer its assistance in organizing and fostering the Junior Legion of Decency in designated parochial schools. It will assist the Junior Legion of Decency in its efforts to get only A pictures—whether A-1 or A-2—shown in the neighborhood theaters on Sundays. It will, with the Junior Legion of Decency, protest the showing of B pictures in the neighborhood theaters on Sundays.

Note: The Legion of Decency classifications are as follows:

A-1 Morally Unobjectionable for General Patronage.
A-2 Morally Unobjectionable for Adults.
B Morally Objectionable in Part for All.
C Condemned.
A-1 pictures may be seen by all, children included.
A-2 pictures are not suited for children, but are unobjectionable for adults.
B pictures are partly objectionable.
C pictures are wholly objectionable.

The general policy of the Legion of Decency is to encourage attendance at A-1 and A-2 pictures, and to discourage it at B and C pictures.

(Rev.) Edward S. Schwegler	Diocesan Director Legion of Decency
(Very Rev. Msgr.) Sylvester J. Holbel	Diocesan Superintendent of Schools
(Rev.) Maurice Woulfe	Diocesan Director Catholic Youth

What are the present results of these policies?

As regards the Legion of Decency itself (Buffalo Council), its most spectacular result is that C pictures simply do not show in the neighborhood theaters, and show rarely even in the large downtown theaters. On certain occasions, especially when the necessary information about the condemnation of a picture has not been available until a day or so before its scheduled local showing, as many as 125 identical telegrams have been sent to the pastors in the audience area of the theater concerned.

As regards the Scholastic Legion of Decency, the students of the Catholic high schools, as already indicated, have pursued and publicized the clean picture campaign with much vigor and enthusiasm.

As regards the Junior Legion of Decency, the superintendent of schools lists the following:

(1) A better awareness on the part of the children in our elementary schools of the Legion of Decency, its classification of pictures, and the need of referring to the classification before attending a movie. The children sometimes go to A-2 or even B pictures, but they know that they are doing so.

(2) Parents and adult members of families with children in our schools are more alert to their Legion pledges. They consult the lists or ask their children to secure the information.

(3) The strength of the Legion has been more impressed on theater managers. Sympathetic ones have welcomed the support of the Junior and Scholastic Legions. Others have learned to recognize and respect the power of these vigorous groups.

(4) With few exceptions, all neighborhood theaters are making an effort to satisfy our demands for Saturday matinees. Again, they do not always do so, but the vast majority really make an effort to comply.

It will have been noticed above that the policy of advocating A-1 pictures on Fridays and Saturdays was changed to the request that only A-1 pictures should be shown at Saturday matinees and only A pictures, whether A-1 or A-2, should be shown on Sundays. In a letter explaining this change of policy the following points were stressed:

To put all this another way: the Junior Legion of Decency will protest the showing of A-2 or B pictures at junior matinees, and both the Junior and the Scholastic Legion of Decency will protest the showing of B pictures on Sundays.

As a result, no protest will ensue if a B picture is shown any evening from Monday to Saturday inclusively. But of course the policy of protesting the showing of C pictures in neighborhood or small town theaters under any circumstances remains in full effect.

It goes without saying that we should like to see A-1 pictures exclusively on Sundays also; but this seems morally, and even physically, impossible of attainment. Therefore we compromise with the exhibitor and say: at least on the Lord's day, on the day of rest and worship, do not show morally objectionable films. That means no B's.

In endorsing the above, the Buffalo Council of the Legion of Decency relinquishes a time-honored policy: namely, of advocating A-1 pictures for Fridays and Saturdays. It does so for these reasons:

1) The older program was a compromise, since hitherto it seemed impossible to influence the quality of the Sunday programs.

2) A recent survey in our schools shows that 80 per cent of our children go regularly (three or more times a month) to the movies, and that close to fifty per cent of these regular "customers" attend on Sundays.

3) The present compromise gives the exhibitor much wider latitude in scheduling B pictures through the week.

N. B. The classifications of current pictures, besides being found in the current Legion of Decency lists, are also to be found in "The Release Chart" of *Motion Picture Herald.*

In my opinion, it serves two important purposes. The children become aware of the moral problems relative to their motion picture entertainment. They have an opportunity to know and understand that there are such things. In addition, the program is effective in discouraging the exhibition of pictures containing morally objectionable elements. I think therefore that you are to be congratulated. I know that with God's help you will be successful. I hope that your efforts will be imitated widely.

It may be interesting to bring up a final point. What about television? What if fairly current motion pictures should be widely televised?

If there should be an ultimate fusion between television and motion pictures, it might result in one, or perhaps both, of two things: a restricted broadcast that would be shown only on television screens in theaters, or broadcasts over telephone systems—"phonevision"—to be paid for by the individual subscriber. In either case, the televised films would have to be widely advertised, and the Legion of Decency classifications would be as useful as ever. An ultimate development could be the insistence that only A-1 films be telecast for Saturday afternoons and no B or C pictures be telecast on Sundays.

EDWARD S. SCHWEGLER

Grand Island, N. Y.

THE UNPREPARED SERMON

It goes without saying that he who enters the pulpit without that preparation which he should and could have given, is guilty of presumption. Nor can he have that intelligent and unswerving faith and conviction which is the fruit of serious and prayerful preparation. His sermon will be either too short or too long; in all probability, entirely too long. It can produce no lasting fruit, and is bound to fall flat. Moreover, what is said in a careless and superficial manner, will be accepted in the same way; consequently, such a sermon will often destroy the little faith left in the cold and indifferent among the audience. None can expect to preach the Word of God in an effectual and becoming manner who does not make it the subject of study and daily meditation. It is especially by *meditative* prayer that the virtue of supernatural faith is to be nourished and increased: "Lord, I believe; help my unbelief." The stronger one's faith, the deeper will be his conviction and power of persuasion. . . . Study, research, and meditation must precede if the sermon is to be clear and the language used adapted to the capacity of the hearers. What one clearly conceives, he is ordinarily able to express clearly.

—Frederick A. Houck, "The Priest as Preacher and Catechist," *AER*, LVII, 4 (Oct. 1917), 395.

THE MEANING OF MARY'S COMPASSION

Part II

Mary's coredemptive work is, in its order, a perfect work also. We shall attempt, then, in the remainder of this article to indicate how, in a participated, secondary, imperfect, yet glorious manner, each of these modes is verified also in her Compassion. With regard to each of these four we shall consider (a) briefly what that mode is in Christ's Passion, (b) how Mary's Compassion participates that mode, and (c) that this participation is unique, found only in her. She alone of all men had been found worthy to participate in the Divine work of bringing God unto men: she alone therefore was, and is, worthy to share in the very constituting of the saving work of that God for men.

Mary our Coredemptrix by way of merit

That Christ redeemed us, fundamentally, by way of merit is beyond all doubt. It could not be otherwise, given Christ's fullness of grace, Christ's headship over all men. Grace is the principle of merit, as life is of activity. In Christ is all grace, the supernatural life of us all even in this sense that each grace found in each man is but a sharing of Christ's grace which flows to each man from Christ. Christ merits for all because Christ acts for all, since He is the actual life of all. "Ego sum vita" and from philosophy we know that operation follows on life. Christ's is the grace of all: all who share His grace form together with Him one Mystical person: and any man in the state of grace merits for his own entire person.

Notice that the merit here in question is merit in the strictest sense, merit *de condigno*. In general, merit is condign when the reward is due in true justice; it is congruous when due out of fittingness. In the first case the very work done is, in real justice, the title to reward; in the second the title is not the action itself but the friendship between God and the one meriting.

In the case of Our Lord it is clear that condign merit is possible from the point of view of the one meriting: for Christ and we are one: and a man can merit *de condigno* for himself. From the point

of view of the work which constitutes Christ's merit that work is, very evidently, intrinsically worthy of reward. The meritorious work in question, namely the Passion and Death of the Saviour, is a theandric act, an act of infinite value: for it is the act of a Divine Person, and springs from the infinite charity of the Man Christ.

Not only is Christ's merit condign: among all condign merit it is unique not only as to its extent but even in kind. This alone is condign merit simply so called: all other is condign merely on a supposition. Between Christ's work and its reward there is complete, objective equality and consequently the strictest justice there obtains. Our condign merits—even those of our Lady—rest on merely proportional equality, and fundamentally on God's merciful promise to reward them. The Passion of the God-Man is intrinsically of such character as to merit even glory itself for all His members.

Is the holy Virgin, then, our Coredemptrix by way of merit? That she is such is inescapable. St. Albert the Great,[1] St. Bonaventure,[2] Blessed John Tauler, and St. Alphonsus Liguori[3] have taught this. We have it too on the authority of Pope Pius X in his Encyclical *Ad diem illum:* "Because Mary surpasses all in her sanctity and closeness to Christ, and because she was associated with Christ in the work of human salvation, she merits for us, *de congruo,* as they say, what Christ merited *de condigno.*" Here the Holy Father indicates not merely the fact of Mary's meriting, but its *nature*—that called congruous as distinct from condign; its foundation—Mary's sanctity and association with Christ; and its extent—as universal *in its order of congruity* as was Christ's merit in its order of condignity.

The speculative reasons for this teaching immediately suggest themselves.

Mary's co-operation in the work of Redemption from the moment of her consent to the Incarnation until the moment of Christ's death, but especially that co-operation which was her Compassion, fulfills all the conditions necessary for congruous merit. In her

[1] *Mariale,* q. 150.

[2] *III Sent.,* d. 4, a. 3, q. 3.

[3] Cf. Roschini, *Mariologia,* II (Rome, 1947), 358.

was a certain maximum of sanctity and charity: a perfect conformity of her will to God's will, together with the perfect carrying out of God's will; and surely her Compassion was itself a supernaturally good work ordered by her charity to our salvation. But as St. Thomas writes, "as a man in the state of grace fulfills, according to human frailty the will of God, his Friend: so does God fulfill, according to His omnipotence, the will of this man, His friend."[4] And the Holy Doctor explicitly applies this general principle to the case of God fulfilling such a man's will with respect to the salvation of others. Other arguments, less concerned with the very nature of merit, but no less strong can also be urged, e.g. the Eve-Mary antithesis. The formal ratio of Mary's Compassion was her meritorious obedience opposed to Eve's disobedience. As the latter occasioned the sin of all, so is Mary a cause of the merit of all. Also, there is Mary's association with Christ in His Passion. One formal aspect of Christ's Passion is His meritorious obedience, meritorious for our Redemption. Similarly, what is formal in Mary's Compassion is her meritorious obedience; also for our redemption.

Given the fact, the most important subsequent aspect of our Lady's Coredemption of us by way of merit is this: it is unique not merely in degree but in kind. God has willed that Mary occupy a place in the scheme of meritorious Redemption that no other can fill. It is distinct both from Christ's meritorious Redemption of us, on the one hand, and from every other person's co-operation in our Redemption on the other.

Our Lady's meritorious Compassion is distinct in kind from Christ's merit for us. First, very evidently, all her work, all her merits, are dependent on His, and merely relative to them. She merited for us only on the supposition that Christ merited for her the grace to do so. Unlike Christ she merited nothing independently or absolutely. Secondly, her merit is not condign, not based on justice, but on friendship, on fittingness. Glorious as is Mary's dignity, yet she is not the head of the predestined, hers is not the grace and charity of all men; neither therefore can the works proceeding under that grace and charity claim *in justice* a meritorious effect as to all men. Neither by reason of her person nor of her

[4] *II Sent.* d. 27, a. 1, q. 3.

personal grace has she a claim to such universality. Lastly, and consequently, we should note that Mary's *de congruo* merit is not absolutely universal, as was Christ's condign merit. She did not merit for Christ, nor did she even *de congruo* merit for herself the very principle of merit, the Immaculate Conception (her *gratia initialis*), nor her own final perseverance. She did, however, condignly merit other graces for herself.

Mary's merit, on the other hand, is of an order higher than that of any other saint's, i.e. her meritorious Coredemption of all of us is not only more extensive than, it is also different from, that of any other person. That our congruous meriting for one another is indeed less extensive than Mary's is glaringly evident. As Pius X pointed out she merits for us congruously *all* that Christ merited for men condignly. For every man, from Adam even until the last human person who shall face judgment, she has merited each single grace. The very principle itself of merit, including our first grace, and final perseverance, our recovery from grave sin, each increase of grace, each actual grace, even the very sacraments and all instruments of grace—all these she has merited for us congruously. At best we can merit *de congruo* some few graces for some few men: she has merited *all for all*. No gift of God comes to any of us which she has not earned for us.

But, as we have said, her merit surpasses that of other saints not only *in extent* but also *in kind*. She alone congruously merited for others not merely the application of graces but even their acquisition. Our merit one for another achieves this, that another shares in the existing treasury of grace: Mary, alone, co-operated with Christ in filling, establishing that treasury. Thus truly did she share in Christ's redemptive action itself. Thus she who by reason of her Divine Maternity constitutes in the hierarchy of the holy an order which is utterly distinct and shared by no other, an order immediately beneath that of the Man Christ and above all other creatures; she is eternally established, too, in the hierarchy of causes of human holiness in an order which is unique, shared by no other. Here again her order is immediately beneath that of the Man Christ and surpassingly above that of any other creature. "Operari sequitur esse"; precisely as our Lady *is* holy so does she *cause* holiness.

This is certain in the teaching of recent Popes, and of the theo-

logians commonly. But not so clear—and very often not clarified by theologians—is the ontological reason why Mary could co-operate even in the acquisition of all graces for all men (save Christ and herself). Among us a more holy person can merit the application of more graces to more persons: but he can never, even congruously, merit the acquisition of any grace for any other person: that is, he can never establish, as Mary co-operated in establishing, the grace to be given the other person.

Mary is not the head of the Church as Christ is, her grace is not properly capital grace: how then could she merit the acquisition of grace for all of us? The problem is very real. We can answer at once, and with truth, that God willed to accept her merits with this goal, willed them to have this quasi-efficacy. We can say, too, and with truth, that charity is the principle of merit and since Mary's charity was ineffably higher than the charity of all other human and angelic persons even taken together, so her merit was ineffably higher. But this latter explains the greater universality of Mary's merit: it does not explain its different manner of operating. The first answer would attribute this different manner of operating totally to God's pleasure, and fail to find anything in Mary to account for the difference. This would seem against God's kindly wisdom according to which He always, in the highest degree possible, confers upon His children the noble dignity of intrinsic causation.

Is there nothing, then, in our Lady to account for her unique ability congruously to store up grace for us? This Virgin is the Mother of God: she is the Immaculate one: she is the associate of the Divine Redeemer. In her there is a holiness which is utterly unique, an ontological sanctity which is the measure of her own moral goodness and which no other can possibly share. That sanctity is the Divine Maternity. It is different in kind from our sanctity. Given Mary's Divine Maternity in the concrete—that is, as including all that personal holiness which rendered her worthy as Mother of God, and secondly, that everlasting association with the Redemptive work of Christ which is already found expressly, though initially, in her consent to the Divine Maternity; given this Maternity as it is in the concrete, our Lady already has a sanctity of an order higher than our own, and eminently, actually including whatever there is or can be of perfection in our sanctification.

The *de facto* Divine Maternity is a limit which actually includes and ineffably surpasses all other merely human or angelic holiness. Because Mary is a true ontological limit beyond which merely creaturely sanctity cannot reach, and to which no other creaturely sanctity can attain: because she actually, eminently has all merely creaturely sanctity, she is intrinsically apt for co-principality in the acquisition of all merit for all lesser saints. Her role in our meritorious Redemption is of a higher order than that of any one created person; and this is true most radically because she is the Mother of God: because, therefore, her own union with Christ is of a higher order than that of any other created person.

MARY OUR COREDEMPTRIX BY WAY OF SATISFACTION

Christ redeemed us, secondly, *by satisfying* for our offenses. Satisfaction for our offense is offered when reparation adequate to the offense itself is made to the one who has been offended: that is, when there is given to him by way of reparation something he loves equally as he hates the offense.

Now clearly the life of the Incarnate Word must be more than adequate reparation for all the sins of all men: for that life has intrinsically infinite value, whereas the sin which God so detests is, in its own reality, of finite malice, and infinite only by reason of Him who is offended.

As between the good of Christ's love and life on the one hand, and the evil of our sin and death on the other there can be no mere balance: there can only be Christ's prevailing. "Where sin abounded, grace hath more abounded." As St. Thomas summarizes it, what Christ offered to God is far more pleasing than all sin is displeasing because of the greatness of the charity which motivated the Passion; because of the dignity of Christ's life, so that it was a truly infinitely pleasing gift; and lastly because of the greatness of Christ's suffering, embracing in general, as it did, every suffering possible to man.[5] In a word, neither the act which is a sin, nor the evil contribution of the sinner is infinite: Christ's reparation is.

Once again it is noteworthy that we speak here of *condign* satisfaction. On the part of the work offered in recompense for

[5] *Sum. theol.*, III, q. 48, a. 2.

our offenses there is evidently more than mere equality. This we have seen. But even in relation to us the satisfaction Christ offered is condign. For in this case, as in merit, Christ's satisfactory works avail for us, because we with Christ form one Mystical Person. His works are the works of that Person: by them the whole person profits. As we then can condignly satisfy for our own sins, so, too, Christ could and did satisfy condignly for all of us. All our satisfactions derive from His, rest on His: He by satisfying for us obtained for us even power to offer our own satisfactions.

Again in this question of our Redemption by way of satisfaction Christ stands more than sufficient—who dares deny that His satisfactions for us are indeed superabundant? Yet He does not stand alone. "Now there stood by the Cross of Jesus . . . His Mother." This teaching that Mary co-redeemed us by way of satisfaction is also found among the writings of the medieval doctors and writers: St. Bernard, very clearly in St. Albert the Great, and in St. Bernardine of Siena. Again recent Holy Fathers, particularly Leo XIII, Benedict XV, and Pius X have made their own this doctrine of Mary's co-satisfaction for us.[6]

In this matter also the fundamental reason for the truth is apparent: merit is the foundation prerequisite for satisfaction: all that is further required is that the work done be afflictive, penal, and ordained to reparation for sin. These conditions patently are verified of our Lady. Surely, as we have seen, her works were meritorious: moreover, they were often penal. Was she not one with the suffering Christ in humiliation, in poverty, in heart-rending sorrow, most especially at His Passion? As St. Albert put it "It is she alone to whom has been given this privilege, namely, of a communication of the Passion. . . . He wished her to be a partaker of the penalty of the Passion. . . . As the whole world is obligated to God through His Passion, so is it to the Queen of all through her Compassion."[7] And beyond all doubt Mary's lengthy litany of sorrows was offered in reparation for our sins, offered for our salvation. From the beginning it was this she had willed, this she had consented to: for to Gabriel she had given her consent to the Motherhood of Him who should be in name

[6] Cf. Roschini, *op. cit.*, pp. 361 f.
[7] *Mariale*, q. 150.

and in reality Jesus: God-salvation. In His character as Divine Redeemer she conceived Him, served Him, suffered with Him. In Him all was ordained to reparation, to our salvation. And in her all was ordained to that same goal: for everything of her was ordained unto Him, and His purpose.

Here, as in the question of merit, it is essential to grasp not merely the fact of Mary's Coredemption of us through satisfaction but also the mode of her satisfying for all sins. Since, as St. Albert wrote, "the whole world is obligated to the Queen of all through her Compassion" it is necessary accurately to know the nature of that obligation if we are to do what we can to repay it by love and devotion. Here again the essential point is that Mary's satisfying for our sins is utterly unique. It is of an order distinct from all others, indescribably nobler and more extensive than all others save Christ's alone.

Mary's satisfaction for our sins is inferior to Christ's, intrinsically dependent on His. Only Christ's satisfaction is perfect, condign. For the offense-sin against God has a certain infinity about it; therefore perfectly adequate or condign satisfaction must have infinite value, and could therefore be offered only by the God-Man.[8] Mary's satisfaction for our sins is then not condign but congruous: it is, as St. Thomas describes it "sufficiens imperfecte sc. secundum acceptationem ejus qui est ea contentus quamvis non sit condigna."[9] Mary could not possibly offer condign satisfaction for us since she is not the head of the elect, but rather a member, the principal member, of the body. Besides, no human person, not even Mary, could offer the perfectly adequate, condign satisfaction which the wise and merciful justice of God demanded. Mary's satisfaction is secondary or dependent: in St. Thomas' phrase, "every imperfect thing presupposes the perfect by which it is sustained: hence every satisfaction offered by a human person derives its efficacy from the satisfaction of Christ."[10] Even Mary, then, can satisfy for our sins only because Christ's satisfaction *for all* sin gives her power to satisfy: without Christ's Passion, through which she is a friend of God, even congruous satisfaction would be impossible to her.

[8] *Sum. theol.*, III, q. 1, a. 2, *ad* 2.
[9] *Ibid.*
[10] *Ibid.*

Granted, though, this dependence on Christ, the satisfactory character of Mary's Coredemptive work is, in its grandeur, beyond all our appreciation. For God eternally so ordaining the rendering of satisfaction for our sins is, in the *de facto* order, impossible without Mary. Christ condignly and with superabundance satisfied for all of us: but to His satisfaction God willed indissolubly to join Mary's congruous satisfaction. Thus, none of our sins is satisfied for apart from Mary. The satisfactory value of all our penal works derives from Christ necessarily: but it derives also from Mary, factually. There is no hope of our satisfying, no hope, then, of salvation except in union with her. Her satisfaction is not only different in kind from that of Christ; it is different in kind from the satisfaction of any other saint.

To penetrate this truth we must realize that, as St. Thomas says, we can indeed satisfy congruously for one another: for those namely with whom we are united in charity. That last phrase is important. A's penitential works do actually have congruous satisfactory value for B (and not merely meritorious value) only if A and B are one in "charity," i.e. both in the state of grace. Among us, satisfactory works, to be satisfactory, suppose sin forgiven: we satisfy congruously not for one another's sins but for the punishment due those sins. But the holy Virgin satisfied even for our sins: original sin and all our personal sins. When A satisfies for B the fundamental power to satisfy—charity—is presupposed in A and B. Mary congruously satisfied for our sins, as Christ did condignly, even before the presupposition of that power in us. Thus, among us, B might well depend on A for actually having *sufficient* satisfaction: but all men depend on Mary, in a secondary fashion, even for the very power to offer *any* satisfaction whatsoever. Thus, not only are her satisfactions more extensive than ours, they are of a higher order than ours, eminent in the order of congruous satisfaction. They reach unto the satisfaction for all human sin, all its punishment, from the sin of Adam until the end of time. She with Christ, under Christ, reaches out to remove all blemishes, all sin, all death from amongst us. She, uniquely, among created persons, is a universal principle of all satisfaction.

What is there in the Virgin which renders her satisfactions of such truly extraordinary character? Why could she satisfy, con-

gruously, for the sins of all men in a manner in which none of us can ever satisfy one for another? We cannot appeal, in her case, as we can in that of Christ, to headship over mankind. Even if we could do so it would change the whole character of her satisfactions. Mary's satisfactions have unique value because Mary is unique. Objectively speaking, abstracting from the subjective factor of intention, a work is of greater weight, greater value according as the doer is of greater dignity. Thus objectively Christ's satisfactions have infinite value because of His infinite dignity. Apply this rule to Mary. She is not merely a friend of God, as any saint is: she is, uniquely, the Mother of God. That office, that dignity is objectively nobler in order, in kind, than any personal sanctity: it is, in fact, the measure of Mary's personal sanctity which is in turn a certain limit for the sanctity of any other created person. Thus, most radically, Mary's satisfactory works have unique efficacy because of her unique dignity, her unique order in the hierarchy of God's creatures. The very note of congruity, then, is more perfectly, more ideally, realized in her works than in those of any other saint: for the fittingness of God's accepting her works as satisfactions is, in a real sense, more rigorous than in His accepting our works. There is a greater approach to equality in Mary's case than there can ever be in ours. Yet Mary is, in person, infinitely distant from the God-head: hence her works are not condignly satisfactory for us, for they cannot be truly adequate in themselves to such an effect.

THOMAS U. MULLANEY, O.P.

Dominican House of Studies
Washington, D. C.

RETIRING AND RISING

Our resolution to go to bed in good time is quite as important as our determination to get up in good time. My experience is that of the two it is harder to go to bed in good time than it is to rise in good time, though each is hard enough, and to do both well means to begin and to end the day with a solid act of mortification.

—Canon James Keatinge in *The Priest: His Character and Work* (London, 1925), p. 24.

". . . AND I WORK"

PART IV

III. OUR PHILOSOPHY OF WORK IS OUR PHILOSOPHY OF THE WORKER

The Value of Creation Arises from the Value of the Creator

That which is glorious is properly the Creator, not His created product, except by its participation in its Creator's glory. It is this error of honoring the product above the producer that bedevils the worker and civilization; and it is not long before even States like Russia, which profess to be the "workers' State," fall into this error more disastrously than the capitalist State; they sacrifice the laborer for his labor; they become the "work's State." "The worker still is greater than his work," says the Greek Menander.

The sacredness of the worker's personality, transcendant over his work, is all "Greek" to the great majority of our university educators, who, with their exclusively materialistic values, must profess that the work is often worth more than the workman. Hence their feeling of kinship with the Soviet Communists who not only teach the superiority of the work over the worker, but also practice it in their millions of labor-slaves. The conflict of the classes would probably not exist, if everyone, government, worker, and employer, realized that the workman must not be valued solely by the profits of his work. Alike "the frivolous work of polished idleness," the product of a worker as industrious as a factory billowing forth smoke and steam, the medical invention saving millions of lives—alike their results are to be judged worthful or worthless only in view of the glory of God, the sole measure of value.

In the symbolic carvings of Gothic churches, it is frequent to have a man at the plough, a woman at a spinning wheel, or some other working figure carved amongst the representations of saints with their books and sermons. There is sanctity in the plough as well as in the prayer book and book of theology. We get God from the machine, *Deus ex machina*, whether the machine be a

typewriter or a lathe or a kitchen range, during the greater part of the day and the greater part of the week.

There is rightness and holiness in boiling potatoes: the fulfillment of God's will and purpose for lives. The dignity and holiness of the high purpose of the worker in his daily work, whatever be its kind, must be recaptured from the tyranny of money-values. Unless man and woman respects his and her spiritually constructive and necessary daily toil, instead of hating its material lowliness and grind, mankind will turn to the destructive savagery of seizure by warfare, both international and intranational, of the goods of others without labor.

The Work of the Humane Man

Man's basic law of existence, after charity towards his Creator, is charity towards his fellow creatures, intended by the Creator in giving man a social nature. Work has one of its missions to make charity in deed possible by assistance given thereby to others. Hence the spirit of charity must be the spirit of all work; it is sin against the nature of work to work unkindly. Work, too, is man's principal payment of his debt to society and to society's Creator for its benefits to him.

As the individual man, the nation of men never grows to its full sturdy stature except by the conquest of self in reasonable and worthwhile activity. Self-conquering work, not neighbor-conquering war, brings the victory in which a nation waxes strong. Undue leisure is undue self-indulgence, which like tropic warmth, enervates and disintegrates the nation's character, while the brisk clime of work develops the energetic nation.

Work is the occupation of peace and of civilized intelligent construction; war is the occupation of violent emotions and of raging brute destruction. The less civilized a nation is, the greater is the amount of its time and energies spent in destroying others. "He that takes the sword shall perish by the sword" is the teaching, not only of revelation but also of reason. It seems however to have escaped the guides of the world's fate that destruction of others cannot be the means of self-construction. The policy most unnatural and most malicious to humanity is totalitarian Communism, the essence of which is universal internal warfare amongst all peoples. Communism is vague and utopian as to what this

devastation would bring, but it is very decided and detailed in its program of satanic hate and violence.

The savage wars and the saint works. Brutish man is ever more ready to run with the blood of conflict than with the sweat of peaceful toil. Work, by its nature, is socializing; war is anti-social. It is far preferable that the sword rust than the plough. The self-centered warrior draws attention to himself by the destruction he wreaks; the worker, in becoming detachment from self, draws attention to his construction and to society, for which he has constructed.

The liberty of society cannot exist when it is unrestrained by the law of work. Like the human will, from which it rises, liberty is at its peak of excellence when it is within the restriction and order of work. "A man is not a slave in being compelled to work against his will, but in being compelled to work against his will without hope and without reward," says W. W. Reade in the *Martyrdom of Man*. Work is subordination of our liberty, not only to God, but also to society. Licentious expansion of our liberty in parasitic exploitation of the work of others angers both God and society, and eventually, destroys the exploiter in destroying society's good will towards him. Society becomes civilized when it transforms the warrior into the worker, the destroyer into the builder, the self-seeking injurer into the beneficent co-operator, the man of hate into the man of love.

The Work of the Religious Man

God's purpose and consequently man's obligation in work is that it be our chief means to give glory to God by perfecting ourselves and neighbor. Work and religion are not two closed compartments of human life; our religion must express itself in every department of living; and our work is perhaps our chief form of living. Even pagan Plato knew this fact, which is apparently unknown to many who think themselves religious-minded: "Have you heard of the saying of Phocylides, that as soon as a man has a livelihood, he should begin to practice virtue? Nay, I think that he had better begin a good deal earlier."

True religion is faith and work; they are the soul and body of religion. Faith without work is dead; and work without faith is sterile. The animal man, like the animal, makes strenuous effort

to supply his needs; but his labor is without faith. It is only when faith, which generates love of God, love of man, love of family and love of society, has its exercise in work, that it receives its spirituality.

St. Bernard and St. Gregory the Great tell us that "he who works prays"; but they both expressly understand, contrary to many "lovers of work," that he prays who works when, how, where, and with what success kindliness and God's will dictate. When Carlyle tells us, "What worship is there not in mere washing!" we can agree with him only insofar as washing is not of worth in itself and not worship, unless the will of God and our love of others is exercised in washing. Otherwise one will find at the end of his days that he has a lot of washing done, but little or no worship.

Carlyle's false view of religion hindered him from seeing that work without faith cannot be religion: "Properly speaking, all true work is religion. Admirable is that old saying of the old monks: 'Laborare est orare: Work is worship.'" It is only through faith in Christ that we can see any sense in his words: "Work while you may; the night cometh when no man can work." For the materialist without the sense of a requiting future life, and for the atheist without a remunerating God, there is in Christ's reason scant persuasion to work. "Work while you may" must mean for such persons: make your life hard with labor for it is soon going to end completely. In their understanding of the lot and purpose of man, the only logical philosophy of living, as St. Paul notes, is the Epicurean's: "Eat, drink, and be merry; for tomorrow you die." For them, work that is not pleasure, in merest logic must be viewed as an unmitigated curse, to be avoided as much as possible. "You are only an animal," they must tell themselves, "and your complete destiny is that of an animal, the ditch." The ancient Wise Man asks us to consider: "What profit has a man of all his labor under the sun?" What in the world can there be in the non-Christian gospel of "work for work's sake"? What can possibly persuade us, or even justify us, in assuming for ourselves an unpleasant burden of work?

Unless the worker can look on life with the Christian attitude of carrying out, albeit laboriously, the infinitely worthful design of God for our living, he can with difficulty resist the opportunity to

live, either through crime or vagrancy, "as the lily of the field that toils not," or to become a Communist, eating his heart out in rage at those who need not work while he is forced to work. God's will on the other hand, when appreciated properly, makes the petty and onerous life greater than the greatest life, in which "life is its own and sole reward," as sensual Sappho sang. It is in the petty, the unvalued, the unnoticed, the hard grind of labor, that, other things equal, God receives from his human creatures more glory in its fuller, more difficult and more docile love. No labor belittles anyone; but one may disgrace any kind of labor.

Man never grows to full spiritual stature, except by the self-conquest and asceticism of work. God made man king over nature; and work is the exercise of his kingship. Man conquers nature in making it serve God's will in social good, a conquest attained only at the cost of the painful and monotonous march of work. Man's pain in labor wins heaven; and his labor brings peace on earth like the perfectly active peace of heaven. Hence, St. Francis de Sales, with his usual soundness of view, preferred labor as a form of penance: "Labor, as well as fasting, serves to mortify and subdue the flesh. Provided that the labor, which you undertake, contributes to the glory of God and your own welfare, I prefer that you should suffer in the pain of labor than in that of fasting."

The Work of the Supernatural Man

The modern buildings of Rome are built on the foundations of buildings ruined and razed many centuries ago. On the natural purpose of man is built his supernatural purpose of glorifying God with God's own participated powers and activity shared through grace in man's activity and powers. The supernatural implies and supposes the natural. Thus man acts divinely in his human actions, giving thereby a supernatural, divine glory to God. In chiding his lazy Thessalonian brethren, "When we were with you, we commanded that if anyone would not work, let him not eat," St. Paul is drawing the conclusion of the Almighty's decree of Eden: "In the sweat of thy brow thou shalt eat thy bread." More; the Apostle was well aware that man could not attain his supernatural purpose of existence, if he neglected to attain his natural purpose of existence through work. St. Paul was well aware, too, of the host of vices, insidious destroyers of both

natural and supernatural perfection, which are the retainers of the court of idleness; as our nursery rhyme taught us: "Satan finds some mischief still for idle hands to do."

Christ the Redeemer spent only three years in His redemptive teaching and three days in His redemptive Passion; but most of His life was spent in redemptive work as the carpenter's helper. When man was to be redeemed from original sin and from his own sins, he was to do his own share of his redemption largely through work. In us it is not the work that redeems the world, but the Worker-Redeemer, mystically working again in our work. We cannot imitate Christ except as workers. Work, in grace, is divine, no matter how Nazarene it be in its lowliness; for, as St. Paul admonishes, "Neither he that planteth is anything, nor he that watereth, but God who giveth the increase . . . for we are God's coadjutors."

Because our supernatural lives in grace, whatever they are, are "the work of the Lord," the Apostle urges us: "Therefore, my beloved brethren, be ye steadfast and immoveable, always abounding in the work of the Lord, knowing that your labor is not in vain in the Lord." The constant intention to work "in Christ" makes a saint of the mechanic at his lathe, of the housewife in her kitchen, of the doctor with his scalpel, of the priest in the confessional, and of the storekeeper at his counter. A life of holiness may, as well as not, be a life of carpentering, as it was in Nazareth.

The sure knowledge that our actions are graced with the Person of Christ, acting in our action, takes away all pettiness from the humanly pettiest life, and gives it a share of the eternal nobility of Christ. In grace, "the Lord thy God will bless thee in all thy fruits, and in every work of thy hands." In grace, Christ works in us for Christ in others; He says now to us: "I am hungry and you feed Me; I am thirsty and you give me to drink"; "inasmuch as you do it to any of these My little ones." Christ, as both the Worker in us and the object of our work, is the ultimate basis of valuation of human activity. Man was not made to accomplish products worth a high price, or notable in the eyes of his fellows, or even of great benefit to mankind. He was made for one purpose: to give glory to God by the greatest possible amount of sanctifying grace, or indwelling of God, in himself, regardless of what he accomplishes. Since this is man's sole purpose, it is the

sole valuation of man. The worker is rightly valued in his work only by the amount of grace with which he does whatever he does, only to the extent in which he participates in Christ's life, only inasmuch as Christ acts in him for the glory of Christ. The worker must not be valued by his work, but the work by the worker. This is sacredness of every worker: the degree in which the divine Worker is working in him. Results of greater or less money-value are not the value of work, not even spiritual results of greater or less good done to souls. All results, natural or supernatural, which are outside of us are not our worth. God does them. The results in the worker of his work are the value of his work, for only so does he glorify God.

Without Christ gracing our work, the question of Ecclesiastes has no answer: "For what profit shall a man have of all his labor and vexation of spirit, with which he has been tormented under the sun?" A man's sure knowledge that his life is a workday with an immortal salary in proportion to the difficulty of his labor, that his life is a campaign of hardship, the sacrifices of which determine the greatness of the Kingdom which is his conquest—such are sufficient motives to make the meanest life the highest of chivalries; and in them the lowliest of human characters become the grandest of nobles whose names and deeds are eternal fame.

Unless "service" is understood as "serving the Lord," we have every right, before we dedicate our lives to "service," to ask why we should serve and what is worth service. Serving Christ in His brethren is sublime and intelligible as a life's ambition; but serving only fellow animals, as materialists must consider our fellowmen, is little nobler and no worthier than the prodigal's serving the swine. Many, on the other hand, through the circulation of grace in the Mystical Body, in hidden lay or religious lives, live "lives of service" of their fellows inasmuch as with Christ they say: "For them I sanctify myself."

IV. SLOTH CORRODES MAN

All Are Workers

Humanity is not composed of species as in a beehive, some of whom are meant to be workers, while some are, like drones, to live parasitically on the produce of the workers, while doing no work themselves. Nature's law is that "he who would eat the nut must

crack the shell," as Plautus puts it. The ancient pagans and their retrogressive modern imitators are inhuman in their theory that those of some race—always their race—are superior by nature while others are intended by nature to do the work as slaves. All men are fundamentally equal in their obligation to work. The inevitability of work is God's Providence for man; and men will find only unhappiness if they seek to evade nature's and their Creator's law for them—thus placing themselves outside the infinitely wise and good providence designed for them. The Psalmist describes man's life as work and praises God's wisdom for such an arrangement: "Man goeth forth to his work, and to his labor until the evening. How great are thy works, O Lord!"

There is no working class distinct from other human beings. As all by nature are meant to eat, all by nature are meant to work. If I produce loaves of bread as a baker, I am no more a workingman than the one who produces poems as a poet, or plans as an executive, or amusement as an entertainer. It is the fallacy that there are masses of workers and classes of non-workers which does so much harm to the nation. All are on the same level of rights, obligations, and privileges.

Christ, precisely as the Worker, the assistant carpenter, is the representative not of a part of humanity but of all humanity in which there is no one who is not intended to be a worker. As Christ took upon Himself the expiation of every man's original sin, He took upon Himself every man's penalty of "eating His bread in the sweat of His brow." "He emptied Himself taking the form of a servant, being made in the likeness of man, and appeared in the nature of man." To be a model for all men, He became a Redeemer who could not be understood as anything else than a worker.

Christ did not so much elevate the workingman as bring home to men that by destiny they are all equally workingmen, and that their redemption and salvation must be attained normally as workingmen. To live outside the lot of the worker is to live, not only outside redemption, but also outside human nature, which was and is redeemed through work. The error of the pagan wealthy, that the worker or slave is of another species of man, was not as great as that of thinking that they themselves were not by nature workers. Of whatever we can predicate human nature, we must predi-

cate worker. It follows that no human being can hold another human being as a bondsman because he is a worker.

Christ did not ally Himself only with a lower class, but as Worker He is a member of the one sole class of human workers, and the Redeemer and Model and Lord of every worker, that is, of every human being. Christ the Worker is not a figurehead of the proletariat, nor an anti-capitalist, any more than He is the banner-bearer of monarchists as Christ the King. He is the King of all in being the Worker-Brother of all. Both the employer and the employee should see in one another the brother of Christ, the Worker. This means that war between the classes is anti-Christian since there are no classes in Christianity—only one class of varying degrees of wealth which, by the natural law, have mutual need of, and obligations to, those of other degrees of wealth. No man is, or can be made, totally the means to another man. All have purposes of equal nobility and standing. Thus the Bishop of Mainz, the noble William von Kettler declared: "No garment, however soiled, no hut, however lowly, no human body, however disfigured, shall hinder us from recognizing under the outer covering the image of God and its destiny." It is not only un-Christian, but irrational, to hold that a worker is a failure because he works with his hands for relatively small pay. The only worker who is a failure is the one who does not fulfill his earthly destiny, as it is designed by God for him, whether his labor be manual, artistic, professional, political, or executive.

The boast of idleness is the seed of bitterness amongst those who are forced by hard necessity to labor. One who is conversant with the Communist's psychology cannot fail to notice that the fundamental element of his protest against social inequality is anger at the idleness of the rich. Idleness seen and imagined in the well-to-do, while the Communist must work hard, is that which above all drives his emotion into frenzy.

The Opiate of Idleness

Sloth is the devil's cushion. Doing nothing is doing evil. The willingly idle, whether rich or otherwise, are a cancer in the body politic. They are a source of jealousy to the have-nots; moreover, they are the greatest enemies of their own home, health, and happiness. Bread unseasoned by sweat is insipid, as is the life nour-

ished by it. It is hard to find a more miserable and restless man than the one who feels that his life hold no purpose to be attained by work. The way of the transgressor of the law of life is hard. King Louis XVI is said to have been standing one day dejectedly, with his hands behind his back, looking out the window, when his minister Talleyrand, coming upon him, asked him if he was not feeling well. "It's worse than that," replied the monarch; "I'm bored." It is true that many poor are carrying a burden of work which crushes their life; but weariness from labor is a far more enviable lot than the ennui, aimlessness, and vice attendant on idleness.

While with the bitter Communist we berate those who have sufficient means to be idle and insufficient stamina of character to work, it were well to see that we are not condemning ourselves "out of our own mouths" by our secret ambition some day to arrive at the life of a sluggard. To work towards a life of total leisure is to work towards the completion of an avenging monster of Frankenstein.

Paradise is not Leisure

There are many idle in desire, who, having no choice in the matter, work laboriously and ceaselessly in fact, while they believe no less than "the idle rich" that they are degraded and cursed by work. In their simplicism, utopia is for them a paradise of idleness.

"Why seekest thou ease, when thou wast born to labor?" Some sociologists look forward to an objective of human existence, in which the necessities of life will be so cheaply and so abundantly produced that there will be scant need to labor. This would be nothing short of a calamity, if it were not a naive reaching for the moon. Abundance without work is a curse. Both individual and social life are enervated and degraded by the opiate of idleness. Man was by very nature made to work; and when he lives contrary to his nature in idleness, he will be unhappy. No man is born into the world whose work is not born with him, observes Lowell; and his work is never done until he is done.

Men will not, by any means, have attained the millenium when they have so arranged that the people will be able to spend most of their time in sloth. The arrangement of man's week by God, "Six days there are, wherein you ought to work," is also the com-

mand of man's very nature. The slogan of the National Labor Union of the United States in 1866 comes close to expressing the optimum proportion of laboring hours to leisure in the day: "Eight hours for work; Eight hours for sleep; Eight hours for what you will."

If labor is not imposed on the sensible man and woman, they take it freely upon themselves in order that their life may be full of purpose and fulfillment. "The blessing of earth is toil," Henry van Dyke says well in "The Toiling of Felix." To live means to labor; and to labor means to live. Recreation periods have their major meaning in the better work for which they are necessary. If our life is in equilibrium, we do not work in order to be able to play, we play to be better able to work. Work is the main course of living; recreation is the dessert.

There is a multitude of vagrants who have found that it is possible to exist as a parasitic burden on society, with little or no work. "There is a working class, strong and happy, among both rich and poor," says Ruskin. Addison is gently satirical in describing in his *Spectator* of 1712 the vacuous lives of many of his contemporaries who enter in their diaries the time they smoked, the time they read the papers, what they had for dinner, the time they went to the club, what they had for supper, what they chatted about after supper and the time they went to bed. The only value that labor has for some is that it makes possible a period of leisure. Although such men may manage to avoid notorious crimes, their very lives of idleness are notorious crimes. Remorse for time idly spent should be second only to remorse for time viciously misspent; for sloth is one of the "capital" sins, one of the chief aberrations from God's salutary purpose in human life.

Killing Time is Killing some of Life

Freedom from physical necessity to labor does not free us from the moral necessity to labor. So do fine characters feel the need and obligation of work, that amongst the hardest of workers you will find many who do not need to work to live comfortably. How much of precious life is spurned by many who seek to kill time! Life is time; and he who kills time kills some of his life. Small gratitude to the Giver of the most valuable of earthly gifts: time! We should all feel, as regards time, as Pippa does, awakening on

her one day of freedom for the year: "My day! My day! if I squander one wavelet of thee!" How much aimless small talk kills the seed of accomplishment, time. "For we have heard there are some of you who walk disorderly, working not at all, but curiously meddling," says St. Paul. How much printer's ink, of positively no worth, blots out stretches of our lives which, when summed up, constitute no small part of our life-span.

"In the middle of the journey of our life, I came to myself in a dark wood, where the straight way was lost." Dante might have been speaking in the person of the idle woman without a purpose, in her forties and fifties. The day begins at noon when the dog must be given its walk. She is of importance to no one, especially to herself, when she might, through social and spiritual work, be of benevolent importance to hundreds who urgently need her work, and be of importance to herself and to God's glory in her.

Give them real work, real jobs, and many women and not a few men will not anxiously seek the psychoanalyst's couch. Many do not attain fulfillment by natural hard work; and they seek to compensate for it by easy, unnatural, drinking and worrying.

Sloth stagnates the stream of bodily life, rusts the mind and corrodes the will. The Book of Proverbs is deep and pungent in its insistence on the blessedness of industry and on the bane of sloth both for the individual and for society. "As vinegar to the teeth and smoke to the eyes, so is the sluggard to them that sent him." St. Paul prescribes as a remedy for social ills and as the furtherance of social welfare: "He that stole, let him steal no more; but rather let him labor, working with his hands the work which is good, that he may have something to give to him who suffereth need."

The idle seeks happiness in his idleness; but it is to be found only in industry. Idleness puts man outside God's Providence and design; and it is natural that man cannot be happy if he is not carrying out his purpose of existence.

FRANCIS J. MCGARRIGLE, S. J.

Seattle University
Seattle, Washington

Answers to Questions

BENEDICTION HYMNS

Question: Please advise me about hymns to be sung at Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament. When is the proper time for the beginning of the singing of the first hymn?

Answer: The *Tantum ergo* and the *Genitori* must always precede the Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament. The Congregation of Sacred Rites has recently declared that immediately before Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament no hymns in the vernacular are permitted. However, the same Congregation has stated that "the custom of singing hymns in the vernacular before the Blessed Sacrament exposed and in the Sacramental Processions may be retained"; but these are sung before the *Tantum ergo*. Consequently, in place of the *O Salutaris* some other hymn of the Blessed Sacrament may be sung, v.g., *Ave verum, Adoro Te*, etc.

Canon Mahoney, basing his opinion on the *Ritus servandus*, feels that it is not contrary to rubrics to begin the singing of the Blessed Sacrament hymn when the tabernacle is opened. He argues that it is not necessary to delay until the precise moment of enthronement before beginning the hymn to the Blessed Sacrament, since the Blessed Sacrament is exposed, though not yet enthroned, when the tabernacle is opened. If one follows this thought, the singing of the Blessed Sacrament hymn begins before the enthronement. However, personal observations seem to indicate that most choirs delay the actual singing until the Blessed Sacrament in the monstrance is placed in the proper position for exposition. In an instruction issued for the province of Rome we read that "at the moment of the Exposition of the Blessed Sacrament, only hymns or motets to the Blessed Sacrament shall be sung."

ANOTHER BENEDICTION PROBLEM

Question: Some places here spread the corporal when preparing the altar for Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament; in other places it is left for the priest when he ascends the altar for exposition. Are both equally correct?

Answer: Martinucci, Wapelhorst, Fortescue and others direct that the celebrant or deacon of exposition spread the corporal which is removed from the burse already placed on the altar. De-Herdt in his *Sacrae liturgia praxis* never makes mention of the celebrant or deacon spreading the corporal but states that immediately after making a reverence, he opens the tabernacle. All of this implies that the corporal is already opened on the altar before the tabernacle. With authorities backing up either custom, we are free to follow whatever method we prefer in this regard.

COMMUNION PROBLEMS

Question: When the communicant approaches the altar rail does he keep his hands under the communion cloth or on top of it? What is the more correct type of communion plate, with a long handle or without one? Are both necessary?

Answer: On March 26, 1929, the Congregation of Sacred Rites prescribed the use of the Communion plate in the distribution of Holy Communion and at the same time ordered the communion cloth to be retained. The *Ephemerides liturgicae* remarks that the communion cloth is now an additional precaution to safeguard the fragments of the sacred particles, and that the decision of the Sacred Congregation did not intend the removal of the communion cloth in favor of the communion plate. The communion cloth is no longer held by those who are receiving Holy Communion but is merely laid on the flat top of the communion rail. It does not serve the purpose of preventing the Sacred Host from falling but it is of a purely ceremonial character. Thus, it would seem from what has been remarked that there is no need for keeping the hands under the communion cloth.

Originally when the use of the communion paten was decreed it was the mind of the Sacred Congregation that the plate be passed from one communicant to the other. This was not always found to be practical or convenient and so permission has been granted for the altar boy to carry the communion plate and precede the priest as he moves from one communicant to the other at the rail. Fr. Collins, in his *Church Edifice and its Appointments*, recommends a communion plate with a short handle at either side, made of one piece with the plate itself. In the event that the altar boy

carries the communion plate it should have only one handle and that a rather long one.

BAPTISMAL DIFFICULTIES

Question: Is there any regulation stating that the ceremonies of Baptism should begin in the vestibule of the church? The *Rituale* does not specify this, although the ceremonies imply that they are begun outside the church proper. Does a deacon, having proper delegation, bless the salt used for administering the Sacrament of Baptism? Are we free to omit the ceremony with the saliva?

Answer: Fr. Weller's large and detailed edition of the Roman Ritual states that "thus vested the priest advances to the threshold of the church. The people with the child should be waiting outdoors." Such a custom is not followed in our country. The sponsors and the one being baptized remain outside of the baptistery. The commentators solve this problem by quoting very explicit directions contained in the *Memoriale rituum*, namely that the priest pronounces the exorcisms with his back to the entrance of the baptistery and in the same place he puts on the white stole, enters the baptistery and puts the usual questions to the sponsors, while he himself remains before the baptismal font. These instructions are contained in latest edition of the *Rituale romanum* which gives sanction to the custom followed by our priests.

In the event that a deacon baptizes, the salt must have been previously blessed by a priest. If there is no blessed salt on hand the deacon may bless it.

The priest administering the Sacrament of Baptism is free to use or omit the ceremony of moistening his thumb with saliva before touching the ears and nostrils of the recipient of the sacrament. Where there is objection on the plea of the ceremony being unsanitary it may be omitted.

SICK CALL CORPORAL

Question: How is the small corporal used in taking Communion to the sick? Is it folded in the usual manner of folding a corporal with the pyx inserted in the opening between the folds or is the pyx to be infolded within the corporal so that all edges of the pyx are covered?

Answer: The corporal is folded in the usual manner as at Mass and inserted in the compartment in the sick call burse, independently of the pyx. The pyx is not wrapped in the corporal.

VEILING THE CIBORIUM

Question: Is it incorrect to leave the ciborium veil on the ciborium although it has not as yet been consecrated? In other words is it true to say that when the ciborium veil is put on the ciborium it indicates that its contents have been consecrated?

Answer: Various authors tell us that when the ciborium contains the Blessed Sacrament it is to be covered with a white silk veil. When the ciborium is on the altar before consecration authors are not agreed as to the veiling or non-veiling of the ciborium. Fr. O'Connell tells us that this is a moot question. The rubrics are silent on this point. Some authors maintain that sacred vessels when exposed to public view and not in use should be veiled from the gaze of the people. Their argument is based on the fact that rubrics require the chalice and paten to be covered before the offertory of the Mass. The same can be held for the covering of the monstrance before and after benediction of the Blessed Sacrament. Authors who argue against veiling the ciborium before the consecration of the particles say that it should be covered with its silk veil only when it contains the Holy Eucharist. One author maintains that before the consecration of the ciborium it should be covered with a white linen veil and after the consecration of the Mass this veil should be replaced by a silk one.

MISSAL STAND COVER

Question: What about the cushion often referred to in the books for the Missal? Is it necessary to cover the Missal stand?

Answer: At the present time the use of the cushion for the Missal has disappeared almost completely. It was used in the early Church and usually was the color of the vestments of the day. It has been replaced by the present day Missal stand made of wood or metal.

In many places one finds the praiseworthy custom of covering the Missal stand with a silk cover of the color to correspond to

the vestments of the day. For a Requiem Mass the Missal stand remains uncovered. This usage recalls the cushion formerly used and mentioned in the rubrics.

WALTER J. SCHMITZ, S.S.

SACRAMENTS FOR THE DYING

Question 1: In a Catholic hospital could a general policy be adopted of baptizing conditionally all non-Catholics who are dying unconscious?

Question 2: In the event that such a policy can be adopted, should all the Catholic nurses be instructed to confer baptism in the situation visualized or should this function be entrusted to only a few nurses or sisters?

Question 3: When conditional baptism has been administered in these circumstances, may a priest also give the dying person Extreme Unction? If so, should he use the complete ceremony prescribed by the Ritual, or the short form?

Answer 1: It seems sufficiently probable that the Sacrament of Baptism can be conferred conditionally on every non-Catholic dying unconscious, unless there is positive evidence that an individual is definitely opposed to the reception of the sacrament. The condition should be "Si capax es," to cover the uncertainty about a previous valid baptism and about the person's present intention to be baptized. This opinion is based on the undeniable fact that there are many persons living in our land who have never been baptized, and yet have a sufficient intention to receive this sacrament contained in their general wish to fulfill whatever conditions God has established as requisites for salvation. From this it would seem to follow that by the law of averages there is some probability that every non-Catholic is an unbaptized person who either explicitly or implicitly desires baptism, unless it is certain that his will is opposed to it.

Answer 2: There would ordinarily be no reason to restrict the information just presented to only a few nurses or sisters. Since

every nurse or sister is likely to be in a situation where she is the only one present with a dying person, the knowledge of what should be done in this situation should be given to all the sisters and Catholic nurses of a hospital.

Answer 3: When conditional baptism is permissible for a person dying unconscious, Extreme Unction may also be given conditionally. *Per se* this sacrament should be given with all the ceremonies prescribed by the Ritual even in such circumstances, instead of in the abbreviated form allowed by Canon 947, 1, for a case of necessity. However, in the situation which we are considering there will usually be sufficient reason for the priest to make use of the short form (cf. Kilker, *Extreme Unction* [St. Louis, 1927], p. 379).

THE DISPOSAL OF A COLLECTION

Question: A Catholic society has agreed to contribute one hundred dollars annually to a hospital for the maintenance of a "free bed." The money is raised by means of a card party and chance books. For several years the proceeds have exceeded the required sum, and the officers of the society have put the surplus into the organization's treasury—seemingly without any doubt as to the justice of this transaction. However, the general impression on the part of those who contribute seems to be that all the money is given to the "Free Bed Fund." This year a new group of officers has been elected in the society, and they feel qualms of conscience about retaining for the organization the amount exceeding the stipulated hundred dollars. They are also wondering if any restitution should be made for the practice of their predecessors. What answer to their problem should be given them?

Answer: In view of the fact that all who contribute evidently wish their contributions to be given to the "Free Bed Fund," it follows as a matter of justice that all the proceeds should be turned over to this laudable purpose, even though they are greatly in excess of the stipulated amount of one hundred dollars. As to the rectification of the past, the principle of the "possessor in good faith" seems applicable. For if—as appears to be the case—the previous officers of the society felt justified in consigning the surplus to the treasury of the organization, no restitution need be

made for what has been spent in such wise that the society is now no richer than it would have been if this money had not been appropriated. But restitution must be made to the hospital, in the form of a gift or a contribution to the "Free Bed Fund," equal to whatever portion of the surplus funds remains, *aut re aut aequivalenter,* in the possession of the society.

RENEWAL OF MARRIAGE CONSENT

Question: A priest is about to revalidate a marriage between a Catholic and a non-Catholic, which was invalid through lack of form, since it took place before a justice of the peace. The priest wonders if he could ask the questions in this form: "Do you renew your consent to take this woman, etc." His purpose is to spare the feelings of the non-Catholic, who in perfect good faith believes that the previous ceremony was a valid marriage, and is going through this present ceremony only for the sake of the Catholic party.

Answer: While it is quite commendable for a priest to make the convalidation of a marriage as easy as possible for the non-Catholic, who is fully convinced that the previous ceremony was perfectly valid, care must be taken lest anything be done which might result in the lack of a proper matrimonial consent on this person's part. For, if he intends his words to be a mere *external* repetition of the consent he gave previously—and which he regards as fully valid—he is not fulfilling the essential condition for the revalidation, an internal and external act *in the present.* From this standpoint, it must be noted that there is a great difference between a convalidation and a *sanatio in radice.* Consequently, the priest should propose the questions as they are found in the Ritual: "Wilt thou take, etc.?"

APPARITIONS OF OUR LADY

Question: Recently a discussion arose among some priests as to the particular nature of the apparitions of Our Lady at Lourdes and Fatima. Some contended that the Blessed Virgin really descended from heaven in body, to make her appearance to the favored persons. Others asserted that what Bernadette and the

children of Fatima saw was only a miraculously produced image of the Mother of God. Which view is correct?

Answer: Either view could be correct. By virtue of the agility which her glorified body possesses, Our Lady could have descended from heaven in a single instant to appear at Lourdes and Fatima. No difficulty against this view can be adduced from the fact that she was invisible to most of the persons, since, according to St. Thomas, a glorified body can be rendered invisible by a mere act of the will of the blessed one (*Supplementum*, q. 85, art. 3). On the other hand, the apparitions seen at Lourdes and Fatima may have been only a representation of Mary, miraculously produced by God for the benefit of the favored ones. This would not have been any deception on the part of God, since even in this event there was a direct communication from Our Lady to Bernadette and the children of Fatima.

FRANCIS J. CONNELL, C.SS.R.

MILNER ON PRIVATE JUDGMENT

To speak now of the Protestant reformers. No sooner had their progenitor, Martin Luther, set up the tribunal of his private judgment on the sense of Scripture, in opposition to the authority of the church, ancient and modern, than his disciples, proceeding on his principle, undertook to prove, from plain texts of the Bible, that his own doctrine was erroneous, and that the Reformation itself wanted reforming. Carlostad, Zuinglius, Oecolompadius, Muncer, and a hundred more of their followers wrote and preached against him and against each other, with the utmost virulence, still each of them professing to ground his doctrine and conduct on the written word of God alone. In vain did Luther claim a superiority over them; in vain did he denounce hell-fire against them; in vain did he threaten to turn back to the Catholic religion: he had put the Bible into each man's hand to explain it for himself: this his followers continued to do in open defiance of him; till their mutual contradictions and discords became so numerous and scandalous, as to overwhelm the thinking part of them with grief and confusion.

—John Milner, D.D., in *The End of Religious Controversy* (Baltimore: John Murphy, undated), pp. 35 f.

Analecta

The April number of the *Acta Apostolicae Sedis*[1] reported the radio address delivered by our Holy Father on March 11 to the more than one million employers and workers of Spain who had gathered in churches and halls to hear what proved to be in short form another *Quadragesimo anno*. In the address our Holy Father devoted his attention to the exposition of Catholic ideals in relation to economic reform, insisting on the right of private property but asserting the crying need for a more equitable distribution of wealth, particularly in the form of just wages. He approached his subject by dividing it into three phases. In the first of these he emphasized the fact that the Church cannot be accused of apathy in regard to the importance of the social question, reminding his listeners that since the publication of Leo XIII's encyclical, *Rerum novarum*, sixty years ago, few questions have occupied the Church to a larger extent than this one. While pointing to the essential position enjoyed by the Church in regard to the solution of the problems involved in this question, the Pope described as necessary to this end the collaboration of the intellectual, economic, and technical resources available to civil authority. In the second phase of his discourse, he came to grips with the thesis that has been described above. Here he condemned the class struggle while stressing the fact that the discussions between employers and workers must aim primarily at peace and collaboration, not excluding, in opportune cases, the introduction of elements of a partnership character into the wage contract. The last phase of the address comprised a consideration of the need for sacrifice and an exhortation to the recognition of the importance of prayer in the mutual subordination of selfish claims.

On March 26, 1951,[2] our Holy Father addressed an allocution to the delegates of the French Sodality called "The Union of Catholics of Public Instruction," praising their labors, blessed by grace and promoted by prayer, to bring Christian influences to bear upon the young who are deprived of the opportunity of edu-

[1] *Acta Apostolicae Sedis*, XLIII (1951), 213.
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 209.

cation in Catholic schools. Our Holy Father prayed that their accomplishments might continue to win sympathy from even greater numbers of those who, still under the influence of secularism, are wont to look askance at their efforts.

At noon on Easter Sunday our Holy Father extended his blessing to the world from the balcony of St. Peter's Basilica. The Pope exhorted his hearers[3] to be renewed in their hearts as Christ was renewed in His risen life. He urged that the peace promised on the first Christmas and actualized on the first Easter should be recognized as entailing an obligation on His followers in regard to the efforts they must make to insure its reign. Such an undertaking should be acclaimed by all, he insisted, as one most worthy of modern civilization, as one most earnestly desired by heaven and earth.

A decree of the Holy Office of April 9, 1951,[4] imposed a most specially reserved automatic excommunication on the consecrator and the one consecrated a bishop, even though the delict be committed under the influence of grave fear (can. 2229 §3, 3°), when the delict consists in the consecration of one not designated or confirmed by the Holy See.

Another decree of the Holy Office, dated Feb. 12, 1951,[5] responded that the prostration called *gonyklisia*, where it is practiced in the celebration of Mass in the Byzantine Rite, should take place after the words of the consecration of the Mass and not after the *epiclesis*.

Apostolic Letters of June 5, 1949,[6] designated St. Gabriel the Archangel as the Patron of all the Spanish ambassadors. Apostolic Letters of Oct. 28, 1949,[7] constituted the Blessed Virgin, under the title of "Help of Christians," as the Patroness of the Diocese of San Vincenzo in El Salvador. By Apostolic Letters dated respectively Oct. 22, 1948,[8] and Nov. 28, 1950,[9] two churches were raised to the rank of Minor Basilicas; they are the Church of the Blessed Virgin and St. Martin in the town of Taal in the Diocese of Lipa, Philippine Islands, and the Church of St. Venantius, in the City of Camerino.

Three prelatures *nullius* were established by the following Apostolic Constitutions: one dated Aug. 11, 1950,[10] gave this status to

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 207.
[4] *Ibid.*, p. 217.
[5] *Ibid.*, p. 217.
[6] *Ibid.*, p. 202.
[7] *Ibid.*, p. 204.
[8] *Ibid.*, p. 201.
[9] *Ibid.*, p. 205.
[10] *Ibid.*, p. 193.

the Apostolic Prefecture of Tefe in Brazil; another Constitution of the same date[11] effected the same change for the Apostolic Prefecture of Alto Solimoes, also in Brazil; a Constitution of Nov. 30, 1950,[12] established in the Philippine Islands the Prelature *nullius* of Batanes and Babuyan in islands taken from the Diocese of Tuguegarao. A decree of the Sacred Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith, dated Dec. 1, 1950,[13] gave the new name of Gulu to the Apostolic Vicariate of the Equatorial Nile.

Three decrees of the Congregation of Sacred Rites established the legality of proceeding to the beatification of various Servants of God: one dated March 5, 1951,[14] took this step in regard to Pope Pius X; another of the same date[15] was concerned with the beatification of the Venerable Julian Maunoir; and a third, also of the same date,[16] made this affirmation with regard to the Dominican Martyrs of Tonkin. On the same date[17] another decree accepted the miracles offered in the cause of the Venerable Francesco Antonio Fasani. Two decrees of Jan. 7, 1951, provided for the further consideration of the causes of Blessed Jeanne Delanoue[18] and of Blessed Maria Di Rosa.[19] Another decree of the same date[20] introduced the cause of Lodovico Necchi Villa.

RECENT PONTIFICAL APPOINTMENTS ANNOUNCED IN THE *ACTA APOSTOLICAE SEDIS*

Domestic Prelates of His Holiness:

May 26, 1950: Rt. Rev. Msgrs. Carlos S. Blanchard, William T. Bradley, Philip J. Cassidy, Sigmund Charewicz, Joseph Maguire, Joseph Pajot, and George V. Rieffer, of the Archdiocese of Santa Fe.

July 20, 1950: Rt. Rev. Msgrs. Thomas F. Cleary, Christian Labonte, and Francis J. Pilarek, of the Diocese of Peoria.

July 21, 1950: Rt. Rev. Msgr. Henry A. Hassel, of the Archdiocese of St. Louis.

Aug. 18, 1950: Rt. Rev. Msgrs. William J. Cain, William A. Crowley, and Valentine Michulka, of the Diocese of Burlington.

Aug. 27, 1950: Rt. Rev. Msgrs. Thomas V. Cassidy, Joseph A. Forest, Joseph P. Gibbons, Joseph L. Giroux, Peter A. Hanley, Edward A. Higney, Cornelius J. Holland, Bernard J. Lennon, Charles J. Mahoney, Thomas J. McKitchen, Antonio P. Rebello, Camille Villiard, and Henri Vincent, of the Diocese of Providence.

[11] *Ibid.*, p. 196.
[12] *Ibid.*, p. 198.
[13] *Ibid.*, p. 218.
[14] *Ibid.*, p. 223.
[15] *Ibid.*, p. 225.
[16] *Ibid.*, p. 229.
[17] *Ibid.*, p. 226.
[18] *Ibid.*, p. 219.
[19] *Ibid.*, p. 220.
[20] *Ibid.*, p. 221.

Aug. 31, 1950: Rt. Rev. Msgrs. John J. Bell, Victor Epinard, Michael P. Kavanaugh, John B. Lamothe, and John F. Reilly, of the Diocese of Worcester; and Wenzel Multerer, of the Diocese of La Crosse.

Sept. 15, 1950: Rt. Rev. Msgrs. William J. Daly, Michael E. Doherty, Daniel J. Donovan, Walter J. Leach, Charles D. McInnis, and Thomas J. Riley, of the Archdiocese of Boston.

Sept. 16, 1950: Rt. Rev. Msgr. John P. Schall, of the Diocese of Lafayette in Indiana.

Dec. 29, 1950: Rt. Rev. Msgrs. John B. Donahie, John W. Kerrigan, and Roland T. Winel, of the Diocese of Columbus.

Jan. 3, 1951: Rt. Rev. Msgr. Daniel B. Harrington, of the Diocese of Helena.

Privy Chamberlains Supernumerary of His Holiness:

July 20, 1950: Very Rev. Msgr. Robert C. Peters, of the Diocese of Peoria.

Aug. 27, 1950: Very Rev. Msgr. William F. Murray, of the Diocese of Providence.

Aug. 31, 1950: Very Rev. Msgr. John F. Gannon, of the Diocese of Worcester.

Sept. 5, 1950: Very Rev. Msgrs. Ralph J. Gallagher, Arthur V. Lyons, John J. Murray, Henry J. O'Connell, Joseph A. Robinson, Robert J. Sennott, and Matthew P. Stapleton, of the Archdiocese of Boston.

Sept. 28, 1950: Very Rev. Msgrs. J. Nicholas Allgeier, Anthony Badina, T. Emmett Dillon, Julian F. Doktor, Ignatius J. Gapczynski, Charles Girardot, Francis X. Guerre, and Michael Shea, of the Diocese of Fort Wayne.

Oct. 21, 1950: Very Rev. Msgrs. Aloysius F. Coogan and Daniel J. Donovan, of the Archdiocese of New York.

Nov. 9, 1950: Very Rev. Msgr. James B. Nash, of the Archdiocese of New York.

Nov. 27, 1950: Very Rev. Msgr. William J. Kelly, of the Archdiocese of Denver.

Nov. 30, 1950: Very Rev. Msgrs. Robert J. Dwyer and William E. Vaughan, of the Diocese of Salt Lake.

Dec. 29, 1950: Very Rev. Msgrs. Harry S. Connelly and Harold J. O'Donnell, of the Diocese of Columbus.

Commander of the Order of St. Gregory the Great, civil class:

Jan. 19, 1951: Michael Francis Doyle, of the Archdiocese of Philadelphia.

Commander of the Order of St. Gregory the Great, military class:

May 18, 1950: Gen. Thomas Hickey, of the United States Army.

Knight of the Order of St. Gregory the Great, civil class:

May 18, 1950: Horace Barela, Charles J. Eckert, Thomas McCaffrey, Frank Eliot McCulloch, Severiano Naranjo, Philip Sanchez y Baca, Louis Schifani, Christopher Schnedar, and Raymond P. Shaya, of the Archdiocese of Santa Fe.

Sept. 29, 1950: Alexander J. Brunini, Edmond L. Brunini, and James H. Keyer, of the Diocese of Natchez.

Knight of the Order of St. Sylvester, Pope:

Oct. 28, 1950: Jonas Valaitis, of the Diocese of Hartford.

JEROME D. HANNAN

The Catholic University of America,
Washington, D. C.

FIFTY YEARS AGO

The leading article in *The American Ecclesiastical Review* for August, 1901, is a continuation of the series on church building by Abbé Hogan, S.S. In this article he discusses decorative painting, and proposes some good suggestions as to the proper blending of colors in church decoration. . . . Fr. Anselm Kroll, of La Crosse, writes on "Church Fire Underwriting." He considers the problem whether it is better to have church property insured in a regular company or in a mutual society formed by the union of diocesan churches or religious houses. He mentions that there is a company of this latter type in Indianapolis which annually saves the diocese about $4,000. He tells us that a larger organization called "The Catholic Mutual Relief Society of America" was founded in 1889 by Bishop O'Connor, of Omaha, which since its inception has handled more than thirty million dollars of church insurance.... Dr. Alexander MacDonald contributes an article entitled "Election Bribes and Restitution in Conscience." He holds that one who accepts a bribe to vote for a certain candidate may not keep the money, even after he has cast his ballot for this individual (as he could if there was question merely of a *contractus turpis*), but must surrender the amount he received either to the state or to the poor. For, he argues, the one who gave the bribe has no right to receive it back, since he got what he regarded as the worth of his money; whereas the one who took it has no title to it, because he has sold something that he already owed to society. He is in the same situation—even though he voted for the candidate he judged most worthy—as the judge who takes a bribe to give a just verdict.

F. J. C.

Book Reviews

THE LIVES OF THE SAINTS. By Omer Englebert. Translated by Christopher and Anne Fremantle. New York: David McKay Co. Inc., 1951. Pp. xi + 532. $5.00.

Perhaps the best way to begin this book review is to agree with the opening words of the blurb: "Here is a book that fills a long-felt need." Our one-volume *Lives of the Saints* are nothing but dictionaries; they give only a thumb-nail sketch of the life of a saint. Hence, we welcome a one-volume work on the Saints that strives to add flesh and bones to a skeleton sketch and that attempts to place a saint before us as a living reality.

The Saints are treated in the order in which their feasts are celebrated in the liturgy. This has entailed a great amount of work, for there are notices on some 2,300 saints. Obviously, all cannot be treated with equal length; short biographies are given of the more outstanding saints; often, just a line is devoted to others. Considering the gigantic task that the author has attempted, it must be said that he has done a hard job creditably well. There are, however, certain points which this reviewer would like to point out. When the principal liturgical feast of a day is a feast of Christ or the Blessed Virgin, the account of the feast should occupy the first place, and the account should be adequate. In this book very little is said about these feasts. With regard to the lives of the Saints, the leading feast of any given day should occupy the first place and receive the lion's share. Failure to do this has caused some disappointing disproportions. Witness the little secondary accounts devoted to such outstanding Saints as John Chrysostom (p. 37), Cyril of Alexandria (p. 57), Gregory the Great (p. 99), Cyril of Jerusalem (p. 107), and Peter Canisius (p. 163). Such national Apostles as Sts. Ansgar (p. 49), Cyril and Methodius (p. 262), Stephen of Hungary (p. 337) and Isaac Jogues (p. 366) deserve more space than alloted here. If the notice of the Saint is placed on the day on which the liturgical celebration is held, it seems strange that Sts. Perpetua and Felicitas are treated on March 7 and not on March 6.

In writing this book, Abbé Englebert sets out to give the interesting and colorful facts in the lives of the Saints; biographies and not homilies are furnished; facts are given and not fantasies; he prefers to show them at work, tell about their lives, and record their works rather than digress, comment, harrangue, and moralize. He says that, through fear of monotony, he has failed to point out in what the sanctity of the Saints consisted or why they have been placed on the altars. In

explaining this omission, he says that a paragraph like the following could be added to every notice given in the book: "Finally let us add that our saint loved God with all his heart, and his neighbor as himself; that he cherished Our Lord Jesus Christ, etc. etc. etc. (p. x)." I praise the author in his efforts to give us facts as facts, history as history, legend as legend. I praise the aim of the author to give us accounts of the Saints that are accurate and historical. Lives of the Saints that are cloying and saccharine are to be avoided. However, I cannot see how the author can possibly fail to point out in what the sanctity of the Saints consisted. True, they all loved God, but the manner in which a martyr, hermit, missionary, teacher, attained to the love of God and manifested that love are four different stories. If we take the words "Life of a Saint" there should be emphasis not only on the "Life" but also on the "Saint." In other words, the manner in which a person attained sanctity is as much a part of the process of history as is the fact that he presided at a Council. That a Saint had a great love for the Blessed Sacrament is as much a part of historical truth as is the fact that he wrote a *Summa*. To bring in this data is not to moralize, nor does it mean that one writes a cloying and saccharine life of a Saint; to overlook these facts is to run the risk of writing a life of a Saint that is not only uninspiring but uninspired. Witness the account on St. Thomas (p. 92). The same things could be written of any contemporary of Aquinas who never attained sanctity. Consequently, this aspect in the lives of the Saints cannot be neglected. It would be better to bring this in and drop many of the one line notices on other saints.

Abbé Englebert does not boast of having written a book in which no errors can be found. (Has any human written a perfect, errorless book?) Little inaccuracies in dates can easily find their way into such a book. However, I would like to single out errors that are more than picayune. Ireland was not dominated by the Romans (p. 106). In this day and age it seems incredible than anyone could maintain that St. Alphonsus was the one who caused the system of probabilism to prevail (p. 297). It is difficult to agree with the author when he says that Christmas is the oldest specifically Christian feast (p. 488).

A debt of gratitude is due to Christopher and Anne Fremantle for giving us this work in English. Perhaps the best compliment that can be given is that it reads like a book written in English by persons with a fine command of the English language. One sentence by Anne Fremantle in the Introductory Note definitely needs revision both from a standpoint of Latin and Canon Law. Speaking of Abbé Englebert, she writes: "So he became a secular priest, being ordained *propter beneficiis*, and thus being under the jurisdiction of no bishop."

The publishers are to be congratulated for the splendid workmanship in the book and for helping to popularize the great heroes of Christianity and the real models of Christian living. Considering the book both externally and internally, quantatively and qualitively, it must be said that the price is very reasonable.

During the course of this book review, I have found it necessary to differ with the author on certain points. It has been a difference along the lines of viewpoint, emphasis, etc. By no means is it meant to take away the credit that is due the author and the book. He has covered twenty centuries of history, from the standpoint of hagiography. That is an intimidating task that has not intimidated him. Saints from the ancient, medieval, and modern world pass before us from out the pages of a single book and the accounts are more than mere dates of birth, profession, ordination, death. To have so much material within the covers of one book is a genuine find. If these pages send us back to twelve-volume lives of the Saints arranged according to months and then send us back to individual lives of individual saints they will have fulfilled one of the purposes of the author. If the pages of this single book make us see the Saints as humans like us, now glorified, as our personal friends, and as our ideals and models they will compensate the author and translators for a work that demanded the patience of a saint.

ALFRED C. RUSH, C.SS.R.

PORTRAIT OF SAINT GEMMA: A STIGMATIC. By Sister Saint Michael, S.S.J., New York: P. J. Kennedy and Sons, 1950. Pp. xviii + 248. $2.75.

The author of this life of St. Gemma Galgani has succeeded in catching the true spirit of this angelic virgin more than any other biographer after the classical biography written by Father Germano, C.P., her spiritual director. We believe that the long and numerous quotations from St. Gemma's writing and from the writings of her associates are chiefly responsible for this accomplishment. The author gives long and well-chosen extracts from St. Gemma's autobiography, her letters, and the recorded words of her ecstasies. Entire letters from Father Germano, C.P. and Archbishop Volpi, her ordinary confessor, throw abundant light on both the sublimity and the difficulty of the case. Her foster mother Cecilia Giannini and other members of the family add their precious testimony to complete the picture. The result is a living portrait of the Saint.

Another characteristic of this biography is the classification of the subject according to the various stages of the mystical life. The progress of this privileged soul from the purgative way to the supreme

mystical transformation is so rapid, so evident, and accompanied by such striking phenomena as to make one wonder how this could happen in this twentieth century and to a girl living in the world.

The translation of St. Gemma's writings entails special difficulty. She had such a charming style all her own, using often colloquial expressions of the Lucchese people. The author has given a happy translation of those expressions and to a great extent she has retained the original charm of St. Gemma's style.

May the well-merited success of this book be of comfort to the author who, as we are told, has lately lost her eyesight.

PASCAL P. PARENTE

BENEDICTINE PEACE. By Dom Idesbald Van Houtryve, monk of the Abbey of Mont Cesar, Louvain, Belgium. Translated from the second French edition (1946) by Leonard J. Doyle. Westminster, Md.: The Newman Press, 1950. Pp. 235. $3.50.

Above Louvain, the ancient Catholic university center of Belgium, there rises a red-brick Benedictine Abbey. The hill is called Mont Cesar. A castle of the emperor stood there centuries ago. Today if one approaches the monastery through the narrow streets of Louvain, one is presented by a magnificent panorama over the city and the enormous dimensions of the Abbey. Going through the church-door one is captivated by the precise and dignified performance of the liturgy and of the Gregorian chant. There, in the sanctuary, among his praying Benedictine brethren is the monk who wrote in these surroundings his book on Benedictine Peace: Dom Idesbald Van Houtryve. He must be now in his sixties, but in full spiritual and physical health, who gives very popular Sunday-sermons and homilies on liturgical topics and whose favorite study is the problem of Our Lady's apparitions at Banneux, Belgium.

This book on Benedictine Peace was produced by a man of peace in a fort of Benedictine Peace. In the first part of the work he points out the sources of peace: the house of peace and the life in a monastery. Then he enumerates the works of peace: prayer, ascetic life, and labor. Within the walls of the monastery everything is ordained and arranged to serve the peace of heart and mind those living there in good will. Whoever enters the house of peace for the service of Good, whoever uses the sources of peace and cultivates its works, will enjoy as a most precious gift, the Peace of Christ: *pax Christi exultet in cordibus.*

The author is full of ideas and suggestions. His work does not disregard the element of sentiment either. Corresponding to his emotions his style is sometimes overdone. He is at home in the whole bibliography dealing with monastic life. He amply quotes the old

rules and the Fathers, and is familiar with the lives of the Saints and with the modern ascetical literature. The translation is good and the form of the book pays tribute to the taste and the printing technique of the Newman Press.

Those who read the book on Benedictine Peace will not only gain a look into the beauty and peace of the monastic life, but will also participate in their hearts this Benedictine Peace.

EGON JAVOR, O.S.B.

QUEEN OF PARADOX. A STUART TRAGEDY. By Katherine Brégy. Milwaukee: The Bruce Publishing Company. 1950. Pp. xvi + 221. $3.00.

Under the felicitous title of *Queen of Paradox* Katherine Brégy has given us a dramatic story of Mary Stuart, the *leit-motif* of whose life was paradox. Crowned a queen in her cradle, she never really exercised uncontested royal authority. She wore the crown of France as consort of Francis II less than a year and a half. Returning to her native land as Queen of Scots, she contended with the fanaticism of John Knox and the disloyalty of the Scottish lords. The final eighteen of her forty-five years of life were spent as captive of her jealous cousin Elizabeth of England. Deprived of the prerogatives of her queenhood during her imprisonment, paradoxically she was buried as a queen in the cathedral of Peterborough and finally interred near her persecutor Elizabeth under the florid roof of the Henry VII chapel in Westminster Abbey.

The author is evidently performing a labor of love in writing the history of the ill-starred Mary Stuart. Her admiration of the protagonist, however, does not blind her to the faults of Mary, who was sinner as well as saint, though sinner principally in public life while a saint in private relations. The rosary of her life had few but sorrowful mysteries. Only the early period of her education and marriage in France could be reckoned as a happy period of her career. The story of her three marriages may be regarded as a mirror which reflects her unfortunate experience of life in general. Her first marriage, that with the Dauphin who soon became Francis II, was not an all-absorbing romance and she was left a widow just before she was eighteen. Her second marriage, with the "man who would be king," her kinsman, Lord Darnley, was a union with a worthless scamp. Before his death by assassination in the gun-powder plot which blew up his temporary residence at Kirk o' Fields, he was father to Mary's son, later King James I of England, who was to realize Macbeth's prophetic vision of the kings who "twofold balls and treble sceptres carry." There was much maligning of Mary in her trial for alleged complicity in the murder of Darnley. Her third matrimonial venture